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What Could Possibly Go Wrong?
The Economic Case for Health Care Reform (circa 2009)*

• Health care reform would increase real gross domestic product (GDP), relative to the no-reform baseline, by over 2 percent in 2020 and nearly 8 percent in 2030.

• The beneficial impact on employment in the short and medium run (relative to the no-reform baseline) is estimated to be approximately 500,000 each year that the effect is felt.

• Expanding health insurance coverage to the uninsured would increase net economic well-being by roughly $100 billion a year, which is roughly two-thirds of a percent of GDP.

* Council of Economic Advisers
Today’s Presentation

• How we model the economic effects of tax and subsidy changes.

• The economic effects of repealing the taxes and subsidies provided for by the ACA.
  – Effects on key economic indicators.
  – Revenue effects.
The NCPA DCGE Model

- **Dynamic:** Future economic conditions respond to current-period policy changes through a dynamic optimization process by households and firms.
- **Computable:** The model utilizes computer algorithms that make it possible to solve a system of nonlinear equations.
- **General Equilibrium:** Prices adjust to a policy changes across all sectors to equate supply and demand.
Features of the Model

• Builds on a “Social Accounting Matrix” for 2017.
• Divides U.S. industries into 27 sectors.
• Divides U.S. households into income deciles.
• Has 50,662 variables and equations.
• Projects results to 2050, and
• Estimates variables and compares them to their baseline values.
Purpose of the Model

• To simulate the effects on key economic variables of changes in tax policy
  – The level and distribution of household income;
  – Real GDP, capital investment, and employment;
  – Government tax revenues, employment and spending.

• Key point: a DCGE model is a long-run model -- no Keynesian elements.
Assumptions

- The ACA taxes shrink the economic activities on which they are imposed. We estimate the positive effects on jobs and revenue of repealing nine ACA tax changes.

- Repeal of the ACA will end the subsidies for which it provides. Under the ACA, some 33 million full-time workers can qualify for subsidies only by working part-time or reducing their incomes below 400% of the poverty level. This creates an implicit “full-time employment tax” of 4.5% on payrolls.*

Income Tax Changes and Subsidies Eliminated by ACA Repeal

- Medicare tax of 0.9% on incomes over $200,000.
- Net investment tax of 3.8% on income over $200,000.
- Tax credits and subsidies to help pay for health insurance for low-income taxpayers.
- A rise in the floor for deducting medical expenses from 7.5% to 10% of AGI.
Excise Taxes Eliminated by ACA Repeal

- Tax of 40% on high cost health insurance plans.
- Tax of 2.3% on medical devices.
- Tax of 10% on tanning services.
- Patient-Centered outcomes research trust fund fee of $2.08 (plus medical inflation) for the average lives covered per year by self-insured plans (ends 2019).
## Effects of ACA Repeal on Key Economic Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Change relative to CBO baseline</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2017</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2026</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘000 jobs</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>‘000 jobs</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>504</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Employment</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Employment</td>
<td>(208)</td>
<td>(8.01)</td>
<td>(210)</td>
<td>(8.81)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$ billion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real GDP ($billion)</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Investment</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imports</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exports</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: NCPA-DCGE model.*
## Effects on Tax Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cumulative, 2017-26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ billion</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ billion</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Revenue</td>
<td>(60.06)</td>
<td>(1.71)</td>
<td>(78.82)</td>
<td>(1.51)</td>
<td>(691.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Tax</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>10.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax</td>
<td>(30.59)</td>
<td>(2.50)</td>
<td>(40.97)</td>
<td>(2.52)</td>
<td>(355.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Income Tax</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excise Taxes</td>
<td>(30.54)</td>
<td>(51.86)</td>
<td>(39.91)</td>
<td>(51.86)</td>
<td>(350.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate and Gift Taxes</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Taxes and Fees</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and Local Revenue</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Government Revenue</strong></td>
<td>(59.76)</td>
<td>(1.00)</td>
<td>(78.43)</td>
<td>(0.88)</td>
<td>(688.27)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Based on NCPA-DCGE model simulations.*
Conclusion

Repealing the ACA would, by 2026:

• Increase real GDP by $393 billion, or 1.97%.
• Increase private sector employment by 874,000, or 0.49%.
• Increase personal income by $174 billion, or 0.76%.
• Have reduced federal revenue cumulatively by $692 billion, or 1.60%.
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