Analysis of Exchange Subsidies and Enrollee Payments in 2016 Senate Finance Committee Chairman's Mark as Amended

	Estimates for Second-Lowest-Cost "Silver" Plan							
	Actuarial Value	Average Premium	Avg. Cost Sharing					
Single Policy	70%	\$5,000	\$1,700					
Family Policy	70%	\$14,700	\$5,100					

Single Person

Income	Premium Cap		iddle of	_	nrollee mium for	Premium Subsidy		verage Cost-	Δι	verage			Premium + t Sharing
				5		,			5			1vy. cos	
Relative to	as a Share of	Income		Low-Cost		(share of	Sharing		Net Cost				Percent of
the FPL	Income / a,b	Range / c,d		"Silver" Plan		premium)	Subsidy		Sharing		Dollars		Income
100-150%	2.1% - 4.8%	\$	14,700	\$	500	90%	\$	1,200	\$	500	\$	1,000	7%
150-200%	4.8% - 7.5%	\$	20,600	\$	1,300	74%	\$	700	\$	1,000	\$	2,300	11%
200-250%	7.5% - 10.1%	\$	26,500	\$	2,300	54%	\$	-	\$	1,700	\$	4,000	15%
250-300%	10.1% - 12.8%	\$	32,400	\$	3,700	26%	\$	-	\$	1,700	\$	5,400	17%
300-350%	12.8%	\$	38,300	\$	4,900	2%	\$	-	\$	1,700	\$	6,600	17%
350-400%	12.8%	\$	44,200	\$	5,000	0%	\$	-	\$	1,700	\$	6,700	15%
400-450%	n.a.	\$	50,100	\$	5 <i>,</i> 000	0%	\$	-	\$	1,700	\$	6,700	13%

Family of Four

Income	Premium Cap	l _n	1iddle of		nrollee mium for	Premium Subsidy		verage Cost-	A	verage	_		Premium + t Sharing
Relative to	as a Share of	Income		Low-Cost		(share of	Sharing		Net Cost				Percent of
the FPL	Income / a,b	Range / c,d		"Silver" Plan		premium)	Subsidy		Sharing		Dollars		Income
100-150%	2.1% - 4.8%	\$	30,000	\$	1,000	93%	\$	3,600	\$	1,500	\$	2,500	8%
150-200%	4.8% - 7.5%	\$	42,000	\$	2,600	82%	\$	1,900	\$	3,200	\$	5,800	14%
200-250%	7.5% - 10.1%	\$	54,000	\$	4,800	67%	\$	-	\$	5,100	\$	9,900	18%
250-300%	10.1% - 12.8%	\$	66,000	\$	7,600	48%	\$	-	\$	5,100	\$	12,700	19%
300-350%	12.8%	\$	78,000	\$	10,000	32%	\$	-	\$	5,100	\$	15,100	19%
350-400%	12.8%	\$	90,100	\$	11,500	22%	\$	-	\$	5,100	\$	16,600	18%
400-450%	n.a.	\$	102,100	\$	14,700	0%	\$	-	\$	5,100	\$	19,800	19%

Source: Congressional Budget Office and the Staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation.

NOTES: All dollar figures have been rounded to the nearest \$100; n.a. = not applicable; FPL = federal poverty level.

a) In 2013, the income caps would range from 2% to 12%; in subsequent years those caps would be indexed.

b) In 2016, people would be exempt from the mandate penalty if they had to pay more than 8.5 percent of their income for insurance.

c) In 2016, the FPL is projected to equal about \$11,800 for a single person and about \$24,000 for a family of four.

d) Under the proposal, subsidies would generally be based on income data from enrollees' tax returns.

Distribution of Individual Mandate Penalties Senate Finance Committee Chairman's Mark as Amended Calendar Year 2016

Adjusted Gross Income	Individual Mandate Penalties						
Relative to	Total	Share of					
Federal Poverty Level (FPL)	Payments	Payments					
	(\$ billions)	(%)					
Less than 100%	0.0	0					
100% to 200%	0.2	26					
200% to 300%	0.2	22					
300% to 400%	0.1	14					
400% to 500%	0.1	9					
Greater than 500%	0.3	29					
Total	0.9	100					

Source: Congressional Budget Office and the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation.

Notes:

a) Individual penalty payments are classified by the income of the tax return filing unit.

b) In 2016, the FPL is projected to equal about \$11,800 for a single person and about \$24,000 for a family of four.

c) Components may not sum to totals due to rounding.

10/9/2009