

June 2017 | Issue Brief

The Effects of Premiums and Cost Sharing on Low-Income Populations: Updated Review of Research Findings

Samantha Artiga, Petry Ubri, and Julia Zur

Key Findings

Recently, there has been increased interest at the federal and state level to expand the use of premiums and cost sharing in Medicaid as a way to promote personal responsibility, prepare beneficiaries to transition to commercial and private insurance, and support consumers in making value-conscious health decisions. This brief reviews research from 65 papers published between 2000 and March 2017 on the effects of premiums and cost sharing on low-income populations in Medicaid and CHIP. This research has primarily focused on how premiums and cost sharing affect coverage and access to and use of care; some studies also have examined effects on safety net providers and state savings. The effects on individuals, providers, and state costs reflect varied implementation of premiums and cost sharing across states as well as differing premium and cost sharing amounts. Together, the research finds:

- **Premiums serve as a barrier to obtaining and maintaining Medicaid and CHIP coverage among low-income individuals.** These effects are largest among those with the lowest incomes, particularly among individuals with incomes below poverty. Some individuals losing Medicaid or CHIP coverage move to other coverage, but others become uninsured, especially those with lower incomes. Individuals who become uninsured face increased barriers to accessing care, greater unmet health needs, and increased financial burdens.
- **Even relatively small levels of cost sharing in the range of \$1 to \$5 are associated with reduced use of care, including necessary services.** Research also finds that cost sharing can result in unintended consequences, such as increased use of the emergency room, and that cost sharing negatively affects access to care and health outcomes. For example, studies find that increases in cost sharing are associated with increased rates of uncontrolled hypertension and hypercholesterolemia and reduced treatment for children with asthma. Additionally, research finds that cost sharing increases financial burdens for families, causing some to cut back on necessities or borrow money to pay for care.
- **State savings from premiums and cost sharing in Medicaid and CHIP are limited.** Research shows that potential revenue gains from premiums and cost sharing are offset by increased disenrollment; increased use of more expensive services, such as emergency room care; increased costs in other areas, such as resources for uninsured individuals; and administrative expenses. Studies also show that raising premiums and cost sharing in Medicaid and CHIP increases pressures on safety net providers, such as community health centers and hospitals.

Introduction

Recently, there has been increased interest at the federal and state level to expand the use of premiums and cost sharing in Medicaid. Current rules limit premiums and cost sharing in Medicaid to facilitate access to coverage and care for the low-income population served by the program, who have limited resources to spend on out-of-pocket costs. Proponents of increasing premiums and cost sharing in Medicaid indicate that doing so will promote personal responsibility, prepare beneficiaries to transition to commercial and private insurance, and support consumers in making value-conscious health decisions.¹

This brief, which updates an earlier brief “[Premiums and Cost-Sharing in Medicaid: A Review of Research Findings](#),” reviews research on the effects of premiums and cost sharing on low-income populations in Medicaid and CHIP. It draws on findings from 65 papers published between 2000 and March 2017, including peer-reviewed studies and freestanding reports, government reports, and white papers by research and policy organizations. This research has primarily focused on how premiums and cost sharing affect coverage and access to care; some studies also have examined effects on state savings. The effects on individuals, providers, and state costs reflect varied implementation of premiums and cost sharing across states as well as differing premium and cost sharing amounts.

Premiums and Cost Sharing in Medicaid and CHIP Today

Currently, states have options to charge premiums and cost sharing in Medicaid and CHIP that vary by income and eligibility group (Box 1). Reflecting these options, premiums and cost sharing in Medicaid and CHIP vary across states and groups. As of January 2017, 30 states charge premiums or enrollment fees and 25 states charge cost sharing for children in Medicaid or CHIP.² Most of these charges are limited to children in CHIP since the program covers children with higher family incomes than Medicaid and has different premium and cost sharing rules. States generally do not charge premiums for parents in Medicaid, but 39 states charge cost sharing for parents and 23 of the 32 states that implemented the Affordable Care Act (ACA) Medicaid expansion to low-income adults charge cost sharing for expansion adults.³ Six states have waivers to charge premiums or monthly contributions for adults that are not otherwise allowed.⁴

Box 1: Medicaid and CHIP Premium and Cost Sharing Rules

Medicaid

- States may charge premiums for enrollees with incomes above 150% of the federal poverty level (FPL), including children and adults. Enrollees with incomes below 150% FPL may not be charged premiums.
- States may charge cost sharing up to maximums that vary by income (Table 1). States cannot charge cost sharing for emergency, family planning, pregnancy-related services, preventive services for children, or preventive services defined as essential health benefits in Alternative Benefit Plans in Medicaid. In addition, states generally cannot charge cost sharing to children enrolled through mandatory eligibility categories. The minimum eligibility standard for children is 133% FPL, although some states have higher minimums.
- Overall, premium and cost sharing amounts for family members enrolled in Medicaid may not exceed 5% of household income. This 5% cap is applied on a monthly or quarterly basis.

CHIP

- States have somewhat greater flexibility to charge premiums and cost sharing for children in CHIP, although there are limits on the amounts that states can charge, including an overall cap of 5% of household income.

Table 1: Maximum Allowable Cost Sharing Amounts in Medicaid by Income

	<100% FPL	100% – 150% FPL	>150% FPL
Outpatient Services	\$4	10% of state cost	20% of state cost
Non-Emergency use of ER	\$8	\$8	No limit (subject to overall 5% of household income limit)
Prescription Drugs			
Preferred	\$4	\$4	\$4
Non-Preferred	\$8	\$8	20% of state cost
Inpatient Services	\$75 per stay	10% of state cost	20% of state cost

Notes: Some groups and services are exempt from cost sharing, including children enrolled in Medicaid through mandatory eligibility pathways, emergency services, family planning services, pregnancy related services, and preventive services for children. Maximum allowable amounts are as of FY2014. Beginning October 1, 2015, maximum allowable amounts increase annually by the percentage increase in the medical care component of the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U).

Effects of Premiums (Table 1)

A large body of research shows that premiums can serve as a barrier to obtaining and

maintaining Medicaid and CHIP coverage among low-income individuals. Studies show that premiums in Medicaid and CHIP lead to a reduction in coverage among both children and adults.^{5,6,7,8,9,10}

Numerous studies find that premiums increase disenrollment from Medicaid and CHIP among adults and children, shorten lengths of Medicaid and CHIP enrollment, and deter eligible adults and children from enrolling in Medicaid and CHIP.^{11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33,34,35,36,37,38,39}

Although some individuals who disenroll from Medicaid or CHIP following premium increases move to other sources of coverage, others become uninsured and face negative effects on their

access to care and financial security. Those with lower incomes and those without a worker in the family are more likely to become uninsured compared to those with relatively higher incomes or with a worker in the family, reflecting less availability of employer coverage.^{40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49} Studies also show that those who become uninsured following premium increases face increased barriers to accessing care, have greater unmet health needs, and face increased financial burdens.^{50,51,52,53,54} Several studies suggest that these negative effects on health care are largest among individuals with greater health care needs.^{55,56}

Premium effects are largest for those with the lowest incomes, particularly among those with incomes below poverty. Given that most states limit premium charges to children in CHIP, most studies of premium effects have focused on children in CHIP, who generally have incomes above 100% or 150% of the federal poverty level. A range of these studies show that premium effects are larger among children at the lower end of this income range, who have greater disenrollment and increased likelihood of becoming uninsured.^{57,58,59,60,61,62,63,64,65} Reflecting the more limited use of premiums among Medicaid enrollees with incomes below poverty, fewer studies have focused on this population. However, studies that have focused on poor Medicaid enrollees found substantial negative effects on enrollment from premiums.^{66,67,68,69} For example, in Oregon, nearly half of adults disenrolled from Medicaid after a premium increase with a maximum premium amount of \$20, with many becoming uninsured and facing barriers to accessing care, unmet health needs, and increased financial burdens.^{70,71,72} Similarly, a more recent study of the Healthy Indiana Plan waiver program for Medicaid expansion adults with incomes below 138% FPL, which requires premiums that range from \$1-\$100 to enroll in a more comprehensive plan, found that 55% of eligible individuals either did not make their

initial payment or missed a payment.⁷³ Research also finds that premium effects may vary by other factors beyond income. For example, one study finds larger effects of premiums among families without an offer of employer-sponsored coverage.⁷⁴ Some research also suggests that increases in Medicaid and CHIP premiums may have larger effects on coverage for children of color and among children whose families have lower levels of educational attainment.^{75,76,77}

Research finds varying implications of premiums for individuals with significant health needs.

Overall, individuals with greater health needs are less likely to disenroll from Medicaid or CHIP coverage and are more likely to have longer periods of Medicaid or CHIP coverage compared to those with fewer health needs.^{78,79,80,81} However, findings vary regarding how individuals with health needs respond to premium increases. Some studies show that individuals with greater health needs are less sensitive to premium increases compared to those with fewer health needs, reflecting their increased need for services.^{82,83} These findings suggest that individuals with greater health needs are more likely than those with less significant health needs to remain enrolled following premium increases, but then face increased financial burdens to maintain their coverage. Other studies find that children with increased health needs are as likely or more likely than those with fewer health needs to disenroll from coverage following premium increases, suggesting premiums may lead to children going without coverage despite ongoing health needs.^{84,85}

Effects of Cost Sharing (Table 2)

A wide range of studies find that even relatively small levels of cost sharing, in the range of \$1 to \$5, are associated with reduced use of care, including necessary services. The RAND health insurance experiment (HIE), conducted in the 1970s and still considered the seminal study on the effects of cost sharing on individual behavior, shows a reduction in use of services after cost sharing increased, regardless of income.⁸⁶ Since then, a growing body of research has found that cost sharing is associated with reduced utilization of services,⁸⁷ including vaccinations,⁸⁸ prescription drugs,^{89,90,91,92} mental health visits,⁹³ preventive and primary care,^{94,95,96,97,98} and inpatient and outpatient care,^{99,100} and decreased adherence to medications.^{101,102,103} In many of these studies, copayment increases as small as \$1-\$5 can effect use of care. Some studies find that lower-income individuals are more likely to reduce their use of services, including essential services, than higher-income individuals.^{104,105} Research also suggests that copayments can result in unintended consequences, such as increased use of other costlier services like the emergency room.¹⁰⁶ Two studies have found that copayments do not negatively affect utilization.^{107,108} In one case, the authors suggest that increases in provider reimbursement may have negated effects of the copayment increases, particularly if not all copayments were being collected by providers at the point of care.¹⁰⁹

Research points to varying effects of cost sharing for people with significant health needs. Some studies find that utilization among individuals with chronic conditions or significant health needs is less sensitive to copayments compared to those with fewer health needs. As such, these individuals face increased cost burdens associated with accessing care because of copayment increases.^{110,111} Other research finds that even relatively small copayments can reduce utilization among individuals with significant health needs.^{112,113,114}

Numerous studies find that cost sharing has negative effects on individuals' ability to access needed care and health outcomes and increases financial burdens for families.^{115,116,117,118,119,120,121,122}

For example, studies have found that increases in cost sharing are associated with increased rates of

uncontrolled hypertension and hypercholesterolemia¹²³ and reduced treatment for children with asthma.¹²⁴ Increases in cost sharing also increase financial burdens for families, causing some to cut back on necessities or borrow money to pay for care. In particular, small copayments can add up quickly when an individual needs ongoing care or multiple medications.^{125,126}

Findings on how cost sharing affects non-emergent use of the emergency room are limited. One study found that these copayments reduce non-urgent visits.¹²⁷ Other studies find that these copayments do not affect use of the emergency room.^{128,129}

Effects on State Budgets and Providers (Table 3)

Research suggests that state savings from premiums and cost sharing in Medicaid and CHIP are limited. Studies find that potential increases in revenue from premium and cost sharing are offset by increased disenrollment; increased use of more expensive services, such as emergency room care; increased costs in other areas, such as resources for uninsured individuals; and administrative expenses.^{130,131,132,133,134,135,136} One state study found increased revenues from premiums without significant effects on enrollment, but authors note a range of program-specific factors that may have contributed to this finding, including it being limited to a Medicaid-buy in program for individuals with disabilities with incomes above 150% FPL who may be less price-sensitive to the increase and the state implementing administrative processes designed to minimize disenrollment.¹³⁷

Studies also show that increases in premiums and cost sharing in Medicaid and CHIP can increase pressures on safety net providers, such as community health centers and hospitals. Several studies show that coverage losses following premium increases lead to increases in the share of uninsured patients seen by providers^{138,139,140} and increased emergency department use by uninsured individuals.^{141,142} One study also found that increases in copayments led to community health centers having to divert resources for medications for uninsured individuals to help people who could not afford copayments and that copayments increased the rate of “no shows” for appointments at community health centers.¹⁴³

Conclusion

Recently, there has been increased interest at the federal and state levels to expand the use of premiums and cost sharing in Medicaid as a way to promote personal responsibility, prepare beneficiaries to transition to commercial and private insurance, and support consumers in making value-conscious health decisions. Current rules limit premiums and cost sharing in Medicaid to facilitate access to coverage and care for the low-income population served by the program, who have limited resources to spend on out-of-pocket costs. This review of a wide body of research provides insight into the potential effects of increasing premiums and cost sharing for Medicaid enrollees. It shows that premiums serve as a barrier to obtaining and maintaining coverage for low-income individuals, particularly those with the most limited incomes, and that even relatively small levels of cost sharing reduce utilization of services. As such, increases in premiums and cost sharing result in increased barriers to coverage and care, greater unmet health needs, and increased financial burdens for families. Further, the research suggests that state savings from premiums and cost sharing in Medicaid and CHIP are limited and that increases in premiums and cost sharing in Medicaid and CHIP can increase pressures on safety-net providers.

Endnotes

- ¹ See Maine Department of Health and Human Services, 1115 Waiver Application, http://www.maine.gov/dhhs/oms/documents/Draft_MaineCare_1115_application.pdf; State of Wisconsin BadgerCare Reform Demonstration Project, Coverage of Adults Without Dependent Children with Income at or Below 100 Percent of the Federal Poverty Level, Draft 1115 Demonstration Waiver Amendment Application, <https://www.dhs.wisconsin.gov/badgercareplus/clawaiver-app.pdf>; Office of the Governor, Kentucky Health: Helping to Engage and Achieve Long Term Health, <https://www.medicaid.gov/Medicaid-CHIP-Program-Information/By-Topics/Waivers/1115/downloads/ky/ky-health-pa.pdf>; and Indiana Family and Social Services Administration, Health Indiana Plan (HIP) Section 1115 Waiver Extension Application, https://www.in.gov/fssa/hip/files/HIP_Extension_Waiver_FINAL1.pdf.
- ² Tricia Brooks, et. al., *Medicaid and HCIP Eligibility, Enrollment, Renewal, and Cost-Sharing Policies as of January 2017: Findings from a 50-State Survey*, (Washington, DC: Kaiser Family Foundation, January 2017), <http://kff.org/report-section/medicaid-and-chip-eligibility-enrollment-renewal-and-cost-sharing-policies-as-of-january-2017-introduction/>.
- ³ Ibid.
- ⁴ Ibid.
- ⁵ Gery P Guy, et. al., “The Role of Public and Private Insurance Expansions and Premiums for Low-Income Parents: Lessons from State Experiences,” *Medical Care* 55, 3 (March 2017):236-243.
- ⁶ Salam Abdus, et. al., “Children’s Health Insurance Program Premiums Adversely Affect Enrollment, Especially Among Lower-Income Children,” *Health Affairs* 33, no.8 (August 2014): 1353-1360.
- ⁷ Carole R Gresenz, Sarah E Edgington, Miriam J Laugesen and Jose J Escarce, “Income Eligibility Thresholds, Premium Contributions, and Children’s Coverage Outcomes: A Study of CHIP Expansions,” *Health Services Research* 48:2, Part II (April 2013):884-902.
- ⁸ Gery P Guy, Jr., E. Kathleen Adams, and Adam Atherly, “Public and Private Health Insurance Premiums: How do they Affect Health Insurance Status of Low-Income Childless Adults?” *Inquiry* 49 (Spring 2012):52-64.
- ⁹ Jack Hadley, et. al., “Insurance Premiums and Insurance Coverage of Near-Poor Children,” *Inquiry* 43, 4 (Winter 2006/2007).
- ¹⁰ Genevieve Kenney, Jack Hadley, and Fredric Blavin, “Effects of Public Premiums on Children’s Health Insurance Coverage: Evidence from 1999 to 2003,” *Inquiry* 43 (Winter 2006/2007):345-361.
- ¹¹ The Lewin Group, Healthy Indiana Plan 2.0: POWER Account Contribution Assessment, Prepared for Indiana Family and Social Services Administration (FSSA), (Washington, DC: Lewin Group, March 2017).
- ¹² MaryBeth Musumeci, et. al., *An Early Look at Medicaid Expansion Waiver Implementation in Michigan and Indiana*, (Washington, DC: Kaiser Family Foundation, January 2017), <http://kff.org/report-section/an-early-look-at-medicaid-expansion-waiver-implementation-in-michigan-and-indiana-key-findings/>.
- ¹³ James Marton et. al., “Estimating Premium Sensitivity for Children’s Public Health Insurance Coverage: Selection but No Death Spiral,” *Health Services Research* 50, 2 (April 2015): 579-598.
- ¹⁴ Laura Dague, “The Effect of Medicaid Premiums on Enrollment: A Regression Discontinuity Approach,” *Journal of Health Economics* 37 (May 2014): 1-12.
- ¹⁵ Michael Hendryx, et al., “Effects of a Cost-Sharing Policy on Disenrollment from a State Health Insurance Program,” *Social Work in Public Health*, 27, 7 (2012):671-686.
- ¹⁶ Michael M Morrissey, et al., “The Effects of Premium Changes on ALL Kids, Alabama’s CHIP Program,” *Medicare & Medicaid Research Review* 2,3 (2012):E1-E17.
- ¹⁷ Bill J Wright, et. al., “Raising Premiums and Other Costs for Oregon Health Plan Enrollees Drove Many to Drop Out,” *Health Affairs*, 29, 12 (December 2010):2311-2316.
- ¹⁸ Michael R Cousineau, Kai-Ya Tsai, and Howard A Kahn, “Two Responses to a Premium Hike in a Program for Uninsured Kids: 4 in 5 Families Stay In as Enrollment Shrinks by a Fifth,” *Health Affairs* 31, 2 (February 2012):360-366.
- ¹⁹ James Marton, Patricia G Ketsche, and Mei Zhou, “SCHIP Premiums, Enrollment, and Expenditures: A Two State, Competing Risk Analysis,” *Health Economics* 19 (2010):772-791.
- ²⁰ James Marton and Jeffery C Talbert, “CHIP Premiums, Health Status, and the Insurance Coverage of Children,” *Inquiry* 47, 3 (Fall 2010):199-214.
- ²¹ Stephen Zuckerman, Dawn M Miller, and Emily Shelton Page, “Missouri’s 2005 Medicaid Cuts: How Did they Affect Enrollees and Providers?” *Health Affairs* 28, 2, (2009):w335-w345.
- ²² Jill B Herndon, W Bruce Vogel, Richard L Bucciarelli and Elizabeth A Shenkman, “The Effect of Premium Changes on SCHIP Enrollment Duration,” *Health Services Research* 43, 2 (April 2008):458-477.
- ²³ James Marton, “The Impact of the Introduction of Premiums into a SCHIP Program,” *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 26 (2007):237-255.
- ²⁴ Genevieve Kenney, et. al., “Assessing Potential Enrollment and Budgetary Effects of SCHIP Premiums: Findings from Arizona and Kentucky,” *Health Services Research* 42, 6 Part 2 (2007):2354-2372.

-
- ²⁵ Gina A Livermore, et. al., “Premium Increases in State Health Insurance Programs: Lessons from a Case Study of the Massachusetts Medicaid Buy-in Program,” *Inquiry* 44 (Winter 2007):428-442.
- ²⁶ Genevieve Kenney, et. al., “The Effects of Premium Increases on Enrollment in SCHIP Programs: Findings from Three States,” *Inquiry*, 43, 4 (Winter 2006/2007):378-92.
- ²⁷ Tricia J Johnson, Mary Rimsza, and William G Johnson, “The Effects of Cost-Shifting in the State Children’s Health Insurance Program,” *American Journal of Public Health*, 96, 4 (April 2006):709-715.
- ²⁸ Bill J Wright et. al., “The Impact of Increased Cost Sharing on Medicaid Enrollees,” *Health Affairs* 24, no. 4 (Jul/Aug 2005):1106-1116.
- ²⁹ Matthew J Carlson and Bill Wright, “The Impact of Program Changes on Enrollment, Access, and Utilization in the Oregon Health Plan Standard Population,” Prepared for the Office for Oregon Health Policy and Research, *Sociology Faculty Publications and Presentations*, Paper 14 (March 2005).
- ³⁰ Rachel Solotaroff, et. al., “Medicaid Programme Changes and the Chronically Ill: Early Results from a Prospective Cohort Study of the Oregon Health Plan,” *Chronic Illness* 1, (2005): 191-205.
- ³¹ Gene LeCouteur, Michael Perry, Samantha Artiga and David Rousseau, *The Impact of Medicaid Reductions in Oregon: Focus Group Insights*, (Washington, DC: Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured, December 2004).
- ³² Utah Department of Health Center for Health Data, *Utah Primary Care Network Disenrollment Report*, (Salt Lake City, UT: Utah Department of Health Center for Health Data, Office of Health Care Statistics, August 2004).
- ³³ Mark Gardner and Janet Varon, *Moving Immigrants from a Medicaid Look-Alike Program to Basic Health in Washington State: Early Observations*, (Washington, DC: Kaiser Family Foundation, May 2004).
- ³⁴ Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, *Maryland Children’s Health Insurance Program: Assessment of the Impact of Premiums*, (Baltimore, MD: Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, April 2004).
- ³⁵ John McConnell and Neal Wallace, *Impact of Premium Changes in the Oregon Health Plan*, Prepared for the Office for Oregon Health Policy & Research, (Portland, OR: Oregon Health & Science University, February 2004).
- ³⁶ Norma I Gavin, et. al., *Evaluation of the BadgerCare Medicaid Demonstration*, Prepared by RTI International and MayaTech Corp. for the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, (Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International and MayaTech Corporation, December 2003).
- ³⁷ Monette Goodrich, Joan Alker, and Judith Solomon, *Families at Risk: The Impact of Premiums on Children and Parents in Husky A, Policy Brief* (Washington, DC: Georgetown Center for Children and Families, November 2003), <http://ccf.georgetown.edu/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/Far%20-%20impact%20of%20premiums.pdf>.
- ³⁸ Elizabeth Shenkman, et. al., “Disenrollment and Re-Enrollment Patters in a SCHIP Program,” *Health Care Financing Review* 23, 3 (Spring 2002):47-63.
- ³⁹ Leighton Ku and Teresa A Coughlin, “Sliding-Scale Premium Health Insurance Programs: Four States’ Experiences,” *Inquiry* 36, 4 (Winter 1999/2000).
- ⁴⁰ Gery P Guy, et. al., “The Role of Public and Private Insurance Expansions and Premiums for Low-Income Parents: Lessons from State Experiences,” *Medical Care* 55, 3 (March 2017):236-243.
- ⁴¹ Salam Abdus, et. al., “Children’s Health Insurance Program Premiums Adversely Affect Enrollment, Especially Among Lower-Income Children,” *Health Affairs* 33, no.8 (August 2014): 1353-1360.
- ⁴² Carole R Gresenz, Sarah E Edgington, Miriam J Laugesen and Jose J Escarce, “Income Eligibility Thresholds, Premium Contributions, and Children’s Coverage Outcomes: A Study of CHIP Expansions,” *Health Services Research* 48:2, Part II (April 2013):884-902.
- ⁴³ Bill J Wright, et. al., “Raising Premiums and Other Costs for Oregon Health Plan Enrollees Drove Many to Drop Out,” *Health Affairs*, 29, 12 (December 2010):2311-2316.
- ⁴⁴ James Marton, Patricia G Ketsche, and Mei Zhou, “SCHIP Premiums, Enrollment, and Expenditures: A Two State, Competing Risk Analysis,” *Health Economics* 19 (2010):772-791.
- ⁴⁵ Genevieve Kenney, et. al., “Assessing Potential Enrollment and Budgetary Effects of SCHIP Premiums: Findings from Arizona and Kentucky,” *Health Services Research* 42, 6 Part 2 (2007):2354-2372.
- ⁴⁶ Bill J Wright et. al., “The Impact of Increased Cost Sharing on Medicaid Enrollees,” *Health Affairs* 24, no. 4 (Jul/Aug 2005):1106-1116.
- ⁴⁷ Matthew J Carlson and Bill Wright, “The Impact of Program Changes on Enrollment, Access, and Utilization in the Oregon Health Plan Standard Population,” Prepared for the Office for Oregon Health Policy and Research, *Sociology Faculty Publications and Presentations*, Paper 14 (March 2005).
- ⁴⁸ Gene LeCouteur, Michael Perry, Samantha Artiga and David Rousseau, *The Impact of Medicaid Reductions in Oregon: Focus Group Insights*, (Washington, DC: Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured, December 2004).
- ⁴⁹ Utah Department of Health Center for Health Data, *Utah Primary Care Network Disenrollment Report*, (Salt Lake City, UT: Utah Department of Health Center for Health Data, Office of Health Care Statistics, August 2004).

-
- ⁵⁰ Michael Hendryx, et al., “Effects of a Cost-Sharing Policy on Disenrollment from a State Health Insurance Program,” *Social Work in Public Health*, 27, 7 (2012):671-686.
- ⁵¹ Bill J Wright et. al., “The Impact of Increased Cost Sharing on Medicaid Enrollees,” *Health Affairs* 24, no. 4 (Jul/Aug 2005):1106-1116.
- ⁵² Matthew J Carlson and Bill Wright, “The Impact of Program Changes on Enrollment, Access, and Utilization in the Oregon Health Plan Standard Population,” Prepared for the Office for Oregon Health Policy and Research, *Sociology Faculty Publications and Presentations*, Paper 14 (March 2005).
- ⁵³ Gene LeCouteur, Michael Perry, Samantha Artiga and David Rousseau, *The Impact of Medicaid Reductions in Oregon: Focus Group Insights*, (Washington, DC: Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured, December 2004).
- ⁵⁴ Utah Department of Health Center for Health Data, *Utah Primary Care Network Disenrollment Report*, (Salt Lake City, UT: Utah Department of Health Center for Health Data, Office of Health Care Statistics, August 2004).
- ⁵⁵ Matthew J Carlson and Bill Wright, “The Impact of Program Changes on Enrollment, Access, and Utilization in the Oregon Health Plan Standard Population,” Prepared for the Office for Oregon Health Policy and Research, *Sociology Faculty Publications and Presentations*, Paper 14 (March 2005).
- ⁵⁶ Rachel Solotaroff, et. al., “Medicaid Programme Changes and the Chronically Ill: Early Results from a Prospective Cohort Study of the Oregon Health Plan,” *Chronic Illness* 1, (2005): 191-205.
- ⁵⁷ Gery P Guy, et. al., “The Role of Public and Private Insurance Expansions and Premiums for Low-Income Parents: Lessons from State Experiences,” *Medical Care* 55, 3 (March 2017):236-243.
- ⁵⁸ Genevieve Kenney, Jack Hadley, and Fredric Blavin, “Effects of Public Premiums on Children’s Health Insurance Coverage: Evidence from 1999 to 2003,” *Inquiry* 43 (Winter 2006/2007):345-361.
- ⁵⁹ Michael M Morrissey, et.al., “The Effects of Premium Changes on ALL Kids, Alabama’s CHIP Program,” *Medicare & Medicaid Research Review* 2,3 (2012):E1-E17.
- ⁶⁰ Jill B Herndon, W Bruce Vogel, Richard L Bucciarelli and Elizabeth A Shenkman, “The Effect of Premium Changes on SCHIP Enrollment Duration,” *Health Services Research* 43, 2 (April 2008):458-477.
- ⁶¹ Genevieve Kenney, et. al., “The Effects of Premium Increases on Enrollment in SCHIP Programs: Findings from Three States,” *Inquiry*, 43, 4 (Winter 2006/2007):378-92.
- ⁶² Bill J Wright et. al., “The Impact of Increased Cost Sharing on Medicaid Enrollees,” *Health Affairs* 24, no. 4 (Jul/Aug 2005):1106-1116.
- ⁶³ Matthew J Carlson and Bill Wright, “The Impact of Program Changes on Enrollment, Access, and Utilization in the Oregon Health Plan Standard Population,” Prepared for the Office for Oregon Health Policy and Research, *Sociology Faculty Publications and Presentations*, Paper 14 (March 2005).
- ⁶⁴ Rachel Solotaroff, et. al., “Medicaid Programme Changes and the Chronically Ill: Early Results from a Prospective Cohort Study of the Oregon Health Plan,” *Chronic Illness* 1, (2005): 191-205.
- ⁶⁵ John McConnell and Neal Wallace, *Impact of Premium Changes in the Oregon Health Plan*, Prepared for the Office for Oregon Health Policy & Research, (Portland, OR: Oregon Health & Science University, February 2004).
- ⁶⁶ The Lewin Group, *Healthy Indiana Plan 2.0: POWER Account Contribution Assessment*, Prepared for Indiana Family and Social Services Administration (FSSA), (Washington, DC: Lewin Group, March 2017).
- ⁶⁷ Bill J Wright et. al., “The Impact of Increased Cost Sharing on Medicaid Enrollees,” *Health Affairs* 24, no. 4 (Jul/Aug 2005):1106-1116.
- ⁶⁸ Matthew J Carlson and Bill Wright, “The Impact of Program Changes on Enrollment, Access, and Utilization in the Oregon Health Plan Standard Population,” Prepared for the Office for Oregon Health Policy and Research, *Sociology Faculty Publications and Presentations*, Paper 14 (March 2005).
- ⁶⁹ Office of the Executive Director, *2003 Utah Public Health Outcome Measures Report*, (Salt Lake City, UT: UT Department of Health, December 2003), http://www.hpm.umn.edu/ambul_db/db/pdflibrary/DBfile_49007.pdf
- ⁷⁰ Rachel Solotaroff, et. al., “Medicaid Programme Changes and the Chronically Ill: Early Results from a Prospective Cohort Study of the Oregon Health Plan,” *Chronic Illness* 1, (2005): 191-205.
- ⁷¹ Gene LeCouteur, Michael Perry, Samantha Artiga and David Rousseau, *The Impact of Medicaid Reductions in Oregon: Focus Group Insights*, (Washington, DC: Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured, December 2004).
- ⁷² John McConnell and Neal Wallace, *Impact of Premium Changes in the Oregon Health Plan*, Prepared for the Office for Oregon Health Policy & Research, (Portland, OR: Oregon Health & Science University, February 2004).
- ⁷³ The Lewin Group, *Healthy Indiana Plan 2.0: POWER Account Contribution Assessment*, Prepared for Indiana Family and Social Services Administration (FSSA), (Washington, DC: Lewin Group, March 2017).
- ⁷⁴ Salam Abdus, et. al., “Children’s Health Insurance Program Premiums Adversely Affect Enrollment, Especially Among Lower-Income Children,” *Health Affairs* 33, no.8 (August 2014): 1353-1360.
- ⁷⁵ Genevieve Kenney, Jack Hadley, and Fredric Blavin, “Effects of Public Premiums on Children’s Health Insurance Coverage: Evidence from 1999 to 2003,” *Inquiry* 43 (Winter 2006/2007):345-361.

-
- ⁷⁶ Michael M Morrissey, et.al., “The Effects of Premium Changes on ALL Kids, Alabama’s CHIP Program,” *Medicare & Medicaid Research Review* 2,3 (2012):E1-E17.
- ⁷⁷ Genevieve Kenney, et. al., “The Effects of Premium Increases on Enrollment in SCHIP Programs: Findings from Three States,” *Inquiry*, 43, 4 (Winter 2006/2007):378-92.
- ⁷⁸ James Marton et. al., “Estimating Premium Sensitivity for Children’s Public Health Insurance Coverage: Selection but No Death Spiral,” *Health Services Research* 50, 2 (April 2015): 579-598.
- ⁷⁹ Michael M Morrissey, et.al., “The Effects of Premium Changes on ALL Kids, Alabama’s CHIP Program,” *Medicare & Medicaid Research Review* 2,3 (2012):E1-E17.
- ⁸⁰ James Marton and Jeffery C Talbert, “CHIP Premiums, Health Status, and the Insurance Coverage of Children,” *Inquiry* 47, 3 (Fall 2010):199-214.
- ⁸¹ Jill B Herndon, W Bruce Vogel, Richard L Bucciarelli and Elizabeth A Shenkman, “The Effect of Premium Changes on SCHIP Enrollment Duration,” *Health Services Research* 43, 2 (April 2008):458-477.
- ⁸² Ibid.
- ⁸³ Rachel Solotaroff, et. al., “Medicaid Programme Changes and the Chronically Ill: Early Results from a Prospective Cohort Study of the Oregon Health Plan,” *Chronic Illness* 1, (2005): 191-205.
- ⁸⁴ James Marton et. al., “Estimating Premium Sensitivity for Children’s Public Health Insurance Coverage: Selection but No Death Spiral,” *Health Services Research* 50, 2 (April 2015): 579-598.
- ⁸⁵ Michael M Morrissey, et.al., “The Effects of Premium Changes on ALL Kids, Alabama’s CHIP Program,” *Medicare & Medicaid Research Review* 2,3 (2012):E1-E17.
- ⁸⁶ Joseph P Newhouse and the Insurance Experiment Group, *Free For All? Lessons from the RAND Health Insurance Experiment*, (Arlington, VA, RAND, 1993).
- ⁸⁷ Amitabh Chandra, Jonathan Gruber and Robin McKnight, “The Impact of Patient Cost-Sharing on Low-Income Populations: Evidence from Massachusetts,” *Journal of Health Economics* 33 (2014): 57-66.
- ⁸⁸ Charles Stoecker, Alexandra M Stewart, and Megan C Lindley, “The Cost of Cost-Sharing: The Impact of Medicaid Benefit Design on Influence Vaccination Uptake,” *Vaccines* 5, 8, (March 2017).
- ⁸⁹ Bisakha Sen, et. al., “Can Increases in CHIP Copayments Reduce Program Expenditures on Prescription Drugs?” *Medicare & Medicaid Research Review* 4, 2 (May 2014).
- ⁹⁰ Bisakha Sen, et. al., “Did Copayment Changes Reduce Health Service Utilization among CHIP Enrollees? Evidence from Alabama,” *Health Services Research* 47, 4 (September 2012):1303-1620.
- ⁹¹ Daniel M Hartung, et. al., “Impact of a Medicaid Copayment Policy on Prescription Drug and Health Services Utilization in a Fee-for-service Medicaid Population,” *Medical Care* 46, 6 (June 2008):565-572.
- ⁹² Office of the Executive Director, *2003 Utah Public Health Outcome Measures Report*, (Salt Lake City, UT: UT Department of Health, December 2003), http://www.hpm.umn.edu/ambul_db/db/pdflibrary/DBfile_49007.pdf
- ⁹³ Ibid.
- ⁹⁴ Bisakha Sen, et. al., “Did Copayment Changes Reduce Health Service Utilization among CHIP Enrollees? Evidence from Alabama,” *Health Services Research* 47, 4 (September 2012):1303-1620.
- ⁹⁵ Bill J Wright, et. al., “Raising Premiums and Other Costs for Oregon Health Plan Enrollees Drove Many to Drop Out,” *Health Affairs*, 29, 12 (December 2010):2311-2316.
- ⁹⁶ Leighton Ku, et. al., *The Effects of Copayments on the Use of Medical Services and Prescription Drugs in Utah’s Medicaid Program*, (Washington, DC: Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, November 2004).
- ⁹⁷ Gery P Guy Jr., “The Effects of Cost Sharing on Access to Care among Childless Adults.” *Health Services Research*, 45, 6 Pt. 1 (December 2010): 1720-1739.
- ⁹⁸ Vicki Fung, et. al., “Financial Barriers to Care Among Low-Income Children with Asthma: Health Care Reform Implications,” *JAMA Pediatrics* 168, 7 (July 2014):649-656.
- ⁹⁹ Office of the Executive Director, *2003 Utah Public Health Outcome Measures Report*, (Salt Lake City, UT: UT Department of Health, December 2003), http://www.hpm.umn.edu/ambul_db/db/pdflibrary/DBfile_49007.pdf
- ¹⁰⁰ Leighton Ku, et. al., *The Effects of Copayments on the Use of Medical Services and Prescription Drugs in Utah’s Medicaid Program*, (Washington, DC: Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, November 2004).
- ¹⁰¹ Deliana Kostova and Jared Fox, “Chronic Health Outcomes and Prescription Drug Copayments in Medicaid,” *Medical Care*, published ahead of print (February 2017).
- ¹⁰² Marisa Elena Domino, et. al., “Increasing Time Cost and Copayments for Prescription Drugs: An Analysis of Policy Changes in a Complex Environment,” *Health Services Research* 46, 3 (June 2011):900-919.
- ¹⁰³ Joel F Farley, “Medicaid Prescription Cost Containment and Schizophrenia: A Retrospective Examination,” *Medical Care* 48, 5 (May 2010): 440-447.

-
- ¹⁰⁴ Bisakha Sen, et. al., “Can Increases in CHIP Copayments Reduce Program Expenditures on Prescription Drugs?” *Medicare & Medicaid Research Review* 4, 2 (May 2014).
- ¹⁰⁵ Michael Chernew, et. al., “Effects of Increased Patient Cost Sharing on Socioeconomic Disparities in Health Care,” *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 23, 8 (August 2008):1131-1136.
- ¹⁰⁶ Sujha Subramanian, “Impact of Medicaid Copayments on Patients with Cancer,” *Medical Care* 49, 9 (September 2011): 842-847.
- ¹⁰⁷ Office of the Executive Director, *2003 Utah Public Health Outcome Measures Report*, (Salt Lake City, UT: UT Department of Health, December 2003), http://www.hpm.umn.edu/ambul_db/db/pdflibrary/DBfile_49007.pdf
- ¹⁰⁸ James Marton, et. al., “The Effects of Medicaid Policy Changes on Adults’ Service Use Patterns in Kentucky and Idaho,” *Medicare & Medicaid Research Review* 2, 4 (February 2013).
- ¹⁰⁹ Ibid.
- ¹¹⁰ Bisakha Sen, et. al., “Can Increases in CHIP Copayments Reduce Program Expenditures on Prescription Drugs?” *Medicare & Medicaid Research Review* 4, 2 (May 2014).
- ¹¹¹ Amitabh Chandra, Jonathan Gruber and Robin McKnight, “The Impact of Patient Cost-Sharing on Low-Income Populations: Evidence from Massachusetts,” *Journal of Health Economics* 33 (2014): 57-66.
- ¹¹² Deliana Kostova and Jared Fox, “Chronic Health Outcomes and Prescription Drug Copayments in Medicaid,” *Medical Care*, published ahead of print (February 2017).
- ¹¹³ Sujha Subramanian, “Impact of Medicaid Copayments on Patients with Cancer,” *Medical Care* 49, 9 (September 2011): 842-847.
- ¹¹⁴ Daniel M Hartung, et. al., “Impact of a Medicaid Copayment Policy on Prescription Drug and Health Services Utilization in a Fee-for-service Medicaid Population,” *Medical Care* 46, 6 (June 2008):565-572.
- ¹¹⁵ Deliana Kostova and Jared Fox, “Chronic Health Outcomes and Prescription Drug Copayments in Medicaid,” *Medical Care*, published ahead of print (February 2017).
- ¹¹⁶ Jessica Greene, Rebecca M Sacks, and Sara B McMenamin, “The Impact of Tobacco Dependence Treatment Coverage and Copayments in Medicaid,” *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 46, 4 (April 2014):331-336.
- ¹¹⁷ Vicki Fung, et. al., “Financial Barriers to Care Among Low-Income Children with Asthma: Health Care Reform Implications,” *JAMA Pediatrics* 168, 7 (July 2014):649-656.
- ¹¹⁸ Leah Zallman, et. al., “Affordability of Health Care Under Publicly Subsidized Insurance After Massachusetts Health Care Reform: A Qualitative Study of Safety Net Patients,” *International Journal for Equity in Health* 14 (October 2015):112.
- ¹¹⁹ Leah Zallman, et.al., “Perceived Affordability of Health Insurance and Medical Financial Burdens Five Years in to Massachusetts Health Reform,” *International Journal for Equity in Health* 14 (October 2015):113.
- ¹²⁰ Bill J Wright, et. al., “Raising Premiums and Other Costs for Oregon Health Plan Enrollees Drove Many to Drop Out,” *Health Affairs*, 29, 12 (December 2010):2311-2316.
- ¹²¹ Gene LeCouteur, Michael Perry, Samantha Artiga and David Rousseau, *The Impact of Medicaid Reductions in Oregon: Focus Group Insights*, (Washington, DC: Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured, December 2004).
- ¹²² Office of the Executive Director, *2003 Utah Public Health Outcome Measures Report*, (Salt Lake City, UT: UT Department of Health, December 2003), http://www.hpm.umn.edu/ambul_db/db/pdflibrary/DBfile_49007.pdf
- ¹²³ Deliana Kostova and Jared Fox, “Chronic Health Outcomes and Prescription Drug Copayments in Medicaid,” *Medical Care*, published ahead of print (February 2017).
- ¹²⁴ Vicki Fung, et. al., “Financial Barriers to Care Among Low-Income Children with Asthma: Health Care Reform Implications,” *JAMA Pediatrics* 168, 7 (July 2014):649-656.
- ¹²⁵ Peter J Cunningham, *Affording Prescription Drugs: Not Just a Problem for the Elderly*, (Washington, DC: Center for Studying Health System Change, April 2002), <http://www.hschange.org/CONTENT/430/430.pdf>.
- ¹²⁶ Rachel Solotaroff, et. al., “Medicaid Programme Changes and the Chronically Ill: Early Results from a Prospective Cohort Study of the Oregon Health Plan,” *Chronic Illness* 1, (2005): 191-205.
- ¹²⁷ Lindsay M Sabik and Sabina Ohri Gandhi, “Copayments and Emergency Department use Among Adult Medicaid Enrollees,” *Health Economics* 25 (May 2016):529-542.
- ¹²⁸ Karoline Mortensen, “Copayments Did Not Reduce Medicaid Enrollees’ Nonemergency Use of Emergency Departments,” *Health Affairs* 29, 9 (September 2010): 1643-1650.
- ¹²⁹ Mona Siddiqui, Eric T Roberts, and Craig E Pollack, “The Effects of Emergency Department Copayments for Medicaid Beneficiaries Following the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005,” *JAMA Internal Medicine* 175,3 (March 2015):393-398.
- ¹³⁰ Bisakha Sen, et. al., “Health Expenditure Concentration and Characteristics of High-Cost Enrollees in CHIP,” *Inquiry* 53 (May 2016):1-9.
- ¹³¹ Marisa Elena Domino, et. al., “Increasing Time Cost and Copayments for Prescription Drugs: An Analysis of Policy Changes in a Complex Environment,” *Health Services Research* 46, 3 (June 2011):900-919.

-
- ¹³² Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, *Estimated Medicaid Savings and Program Impacts of Service Limitations, Copayments, and Premiums*, (Baltimore, MD: Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, December 2010), <https://mmcp.dhmh.maryland.gov/Documents/medicaidsavingsJCRfinal12-10.pdf>.
- ¹³³ Health Management Associates, *Co-pays for Nonemergent Use of Hospital Emergency Rooms: Cost Effectiveness and Feasibility Analysis*, Prepared for the Texas Health and Human Services Commission, (Austin, TX: Health and Human Services Commission, May 2008).
- ¹³⁴ Neal T Wallace, et. al., “How Effective are Copayments in Reducing Expenditures for Low-Income Adult Medicaid Beneficiaries? Experience from the Oregon Health Plan,” *Health Services Research* 43, 3 (April 2008):515-530.
- ¹³⁵ Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System, *Fiscal Impact of Implementing Cost Sharing and Benchmark Benefit Provisions of the Federal Deficit Reduction Act of 2005*, (Phoenix, AZ: Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System, December 2006), <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.482.6057&rep=rep1&type=pdf>.
- ¹³⁶ Steven Crawford and Garth L Splinter, *It's Health Care, Not Welfare: Appropriate Rate Structure for Services Rendered and Estimated Percent of Co-Pays Collected Under the Medicaid Program*, Prepared for the Oklahoma Health Care Authority, (Oklahoma City, OK: Oklahoma Health Care Authority, January 2004).
- ¹³⁷ Gina A Livermore, et. al., “Premium Increases in State Health Insurance Programs: Lessons from a Case Study of the Massachusetts Medicaid Buy-in Program,” *Inquiry* 44 (Winter 2007):428-442.
- ¹³⁸ Stephen Zuckerman, Dawn M Miller, and Emily Shelton Page, “Missouri’s 2005 Medicaid Cuts: How Did they Affect Enrollees and Providers?,” *Health Affairs* 28, 2, (2009):w335-w345.
- ¹³⁹ Mark Gardner and Janet Varon, *Moving Immigrants from a Medicaid Look-Alike Program to Basic Health in Washington State: Early Observations*, (Washington, DC: Kaiser Family Foundation, May 2004).
- ¹⁴⁰ Pamela Hines, et. al., *Assessing the Early Impacts of OHP2: A Pilot Study of Federally Qualified Health Centers Impact in Multnomah and Washington Counties*, Prepared for Office for Oregon Health Policy & Research, (Salem, OR: Office for Oregon Health Policy & Research, December 2003).
- ¹⁴¹ Robert A Lowe, et. al. “Impact of Medicaid Cutbacks on Emergency Department Use: The Oregon Experience,” *Annals of Emergency Medicine* 52, 6 (December 2008):626-534.
- ¹⁴² Mark Gardner and Janet Varon, *Moving Immigrants from a Medicaid Look-Alike Program to Basic Health in Washington State: Early Observations*, (Washington, DC: Kaiser Family Foundation, May 2004).
- ¹⁴³ Pamela Hines, et. al., *Assessing the Early Impacts of OHP2: A Pilot Study of Federally Qualified Health Centers Impact in Multnomah and Washington Counties*, Prepared for Office for Oregon Health Policy & Research, (Salem, OR: Office for Oregon Health Policy & Research, December 2003).