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Urban Institute releases report on *The Uninsured in New Mexico*
187,000 New Mexicans (10.5 percent) under age 65 are uninsured

SANTA FE – New Mexico Human Services Department (NMHSD) funded a report, *The Uninsured in New Mexico* released today by the Urban Institute that finds 187,000 New Mexicans (10.5 percent) under age 65 are uninsured.

“Governor Lujan Grisham and HSD are dedicated to ensuring New Mexicans have access to quality, affordable health care coverage,” said Abuko D. Estrada, coverage innovation officer with HSD’s Medical Assistance Division. “With this data from the Urban Institute, the administration can tackle the challenge of increasing coverage and improving affordability for the over 187,000 New Mexicans, under age 65, who remain uninsured and the thousands more who are underinsured, struggling to pay for their medical care due to high out-of-pocket costs.”

Over half of the uninsured are already eligible for coverage options available today, such as Medicaid or an Exchange plan. The administration is coordinating with our health insurance exchange, *beWellNM*, and developing targeted outreach and enrollment efforts to reach those New Mexicans and get them covered. For those that remain uninsured or underinsured, the administration is developing options that will help more hardworking New Mexicans get health insurance that works for their family’s budget.

The Human Services Department provides services and benefits to more than 1 million New Mexicans through several programs including: the Medicaid Program, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), Child Support Program, and several Behavioral Health Services.

About the Urban Institute
The nonprofit Urban Institute is a leading research organization dedicated to developing evidence-based insights that improve people's lives and strengthen communities. For 50 years, Urban has been the trusted source for rigorous analysis of complex social and economic issues; strategic advice to policymakers, philanthropists, and practitioners; and new, promising ideas that expand opportunities for all. Our work inspires effective decisions that advance fairness and enhance the well-being of people and places.
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The Uninsured in New Mexico

Health insurance coverage expanded substantially in the United States after the implementation of the Affordable Care Act (ACA) in 2014; between 2013 and 2016, the number of uninsured people fell by 18.5 million (Skopec, Holahan, and Elmendorf 2018). Those gains in coverage are distributed unevenly across states, depending in part on states’ decisions to expand Medicaid. Beginning in 2017, however, coverage gains have stalled, and recent evidence finds a slight increase in the number of uninsured nationally (Skopec, Holahan, and Elmendorf 2019). Policymakers in New Mexico, like those in many other states, are looking for ways to build on the ACA to stabilize and increase coverage for their constituents. To help with those efforts, we examine the characteristics of uninsured New Mexicans, highlighting populations that could benefit from targeted policies.

We estimate that New Mexico's total population is 2.15 million in 2019, of whom 1.78 million are under age 65 (hereafter called the nonelderly). Of those nonelderly residents, we estimate about 187,000, or 10.5 percent, are uninsured in 2019. This is lower than the national uninsurance rate for this population (11.2 percent).

This brief presents detailed information on New Mexico’s nonelderly uninsured population using a rich set of demographic, employment, citizenship, and family income characteristics. We also present estimates of the distribution of the uninsured population by their eligibility for Medicaid or premium tax credits in the ACA Marketplace. New Mexico is one of 33 states that chose to expand Medicaid to low-income nondisabled adults under the ACA, and this decision has had substantial implications for the number and characteristics of people who remain uninsured in 2019. Finally, we present information on how the uninsured population is distributed by substate regions within New Mexico. Our detailed analysis provides valuable information to state policymakers designing policies and outreach that aim to expand insurance coverage in the state.

Our analysis is based on the Urban Institute’s Health Insurance Policy Simulation Model (HIPSM). HIPSM is a powerful analytic tool that estimates insurance coverage and costs under current conditions and possible future changes in policy. With data on over 6 million people, the model can produce estimates for specific states and substate regions. HIPSM is calibrated to match the most recent administrative data on enrollment in Medicaid and the Marketplaces, and its health care expenditure estimates align with state totals. Simulated decisions within HIPSM, grounded in the best available
economic research, predict how individuals, families, and employers will respond to changes in the availability and costs of coverage. We explain the model’s capabilities and limitations further in the methods section at the end of this brief.

Statewide Findings

Here we discuss select results from the detailed findings presented in the tables. Table 1 provides data on the uninsured nationally and in New Mexico.

Socioeconomic Characteristics

**Income.** The distribution of uninsurance by income shows the impact of New Mexico’s Medicaid expansion (table 1). About 39 percent of the uninsured in New Mexico have incomes below 138 percent of the federal poverty level (FPL). However, this income group has a lower uninsurance rate (8.9 percent) than all other income groups but the wealthiest (with incomes over 400 percent of FPL). Conversely, in states that have not expanded Medicaid, this lowest-income group generally has the highest uninsurance rate (Skopec, Holahan, and Elmendorf 2019). Nationwide, combining states that have and have not expanded Medicaid as of 2017, about 55 percent of the uninsured have incomes below 138 percent FPL, and 16.6 percent of people in that income range are uninsured.

The next income group, 138 to 200 percent of FPL, makes up almost 20 percent of New Mexico’s uninsured population and has an uninsurance rate of 18.6 percent. Similarly, the third income group, 200 to 300 percent of FPL, also composes about one-fifth of the uninsured population and has an uninsurance rate of 16.8 percent. Those with incomes in the highest two groups make up a smaller portion of the uninsured and have lower uninsurance rates (figure 1). Estimates of the uninsured by adjusted gross income show similar findings; uninsurance rates among those with the lowest incomes are below the national average, at least partially because the state expanded Medicaid. Uninsurance rates increase as income increases between $10,000 and $50,000 but falls again as incomes increase further.¹
FIGURE 1
Health Coverage and Uninsurance Rates among Nonelderly New Mexicans, by Income As a Percentage of the Federal Poverty Level, 2019

Source: Urban Institute Health Insurance Policy Simulation Model.
Notes: FPL = federal poverty level. Data include those below age 65 not enrolled in Medicare. Because 807,000 New Mexicans have incomes below 138 percent of the federal poverty level, the bar representing this group extends beyond the chart.
**TABLE 1**

Characteristics of the Nonelderly Uninsured in New Mexico, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>NATIONAL</th>
<th></th>
<th>NEW MEXICO</th>
<th></th>
<th>Uninsured American Indians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,000s of</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Uninsurance rate (%)</td>
<td>1,000s of</td>
<td>% of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>uninsured</td>
<td>total</td>
<td></td>
<td>uninsured</td>
<td>total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30,832</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified adjusted gross income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as a percentage of FPL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;= 138% FPL</td>
<td>16,813</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139–200% FPL</td>
<td>4,630</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200–300% FPL</td>
<td>4,774</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300–400% FPL</td>
<td>2,139</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 400%</td>
<td>2,476</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted gross income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$1</td>
<td>4,087</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1–10,000</td>
<td>4,097</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000–25,000</td>
<td>7,907</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000–50,000</td>
<td>8,231</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000–75,000</td>
<td>3,518</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000–100,000</td>
<td>1,376</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $100,000</td>
<td>1,617</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic white</td>
<td>12,131</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>11,901</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic black</td>
<td>4,054</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1,592</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–18</td>
<td>4,721</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19–34</td>
<td>12,029</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35–54</td>
<td>10,513</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55–64</td>
<td>3,569</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16,734</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14,098</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Education level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NATIONAL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>NEW MEXICO</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Uninsured American Indians</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,000s of uninsured</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Uninsurance rate (%)</td>
<td>1,000s of uninsured</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Uninsurance rate (%)</td>
<td>1,000s of uninsured</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Uninsurance rate (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>6,233</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>10,704</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>5,692</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>3,481</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>26,111</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### English proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NATIONAL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>NEW MEXICO</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Uninsured American Indians</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,000s of uninsured</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Uninsurance rate (%)</td>
<td>1,000s of uninsured</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Uninsurance rate (%)</td>
<td>1,000s of uninsured</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Uninsurance rate (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaks English very well or better</td>
<td>18,542</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not speak English very well or is less proficient</td>
<td>7,569</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Employment status

#### Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NATIONAL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>NEW MEXICO</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Uninsured American Indians</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,000s of uninsured</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Uninsurance rate (%)</td>
<td>1,000s of uninsured</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Uninsurance rate (%)</td>
<td>1,000s of uninsured</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Uninsurance rate (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No workers</td>
<td>6,956</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only part-time worker(s)</td>
<td>2,609</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One full-time worker</td>
<td>17,352</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one full-time worker</td>
<td>3,916</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>26,111</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not working</td>
<td>9,155</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>2,464</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>14,492</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Employer offer for health coverage in the family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NATIONAL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>NEW MEXICO</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Uninsured American Indians</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,000s of uninsured</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Uninsurance rate (%)</td>
<td>1,000s of uninsured</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Uninsurance rate (%)</td>
<td>1,000s of uninsured</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Uninsurance rate (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No offer</td>
<td>21,281</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one family member has an employer coverage offer</td>
<td>9,552</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major industry</td>
<td>NATIONAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEW MEXICO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uninsured under Current Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,000s of uninsured</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Uninsurance rate (%)</td>
<td>1,000s of uninsured</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Uninsurance rate (%)</td>
<td>1,000s of uninsured</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Uninsurance rate (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major industry</td>
<td>16,081</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, forestry, fishing, and hunting</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>1,419</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>2,085</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale and retail trade</td>
<td>2,383</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and utilities</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial activities</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and business services</td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational and health services</td>
<td>2,063</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and hospitality</td>
<td>2,742</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services</td>
<td>1,229</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm size</td>
<td>13,572</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–49 people</td>
<td>5,730</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–99 people</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100–499 people</td>
<td>1,598</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500–999 people</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000+ people</td>
<td>4,808</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US citizen</td>
<td>21,514</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncitizen</td>
<td>9,319</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All US citizens</td>
<td>19,880</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one noncitizen</td>
<td>10,952</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family SNAP receipt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No SNAP receipt</td>
<td>23,141</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one family member receives SNAP</td>
<td>7,692</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Eligibility for government subsidized health insurance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NATIONAL 1,000s of uninsured</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>Uninsurance rate (%)</th>
<th>NEW MEXICO 1,000s of uninsured</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>Uninsurance rate (%)</th>
<th>Uninsured American Indians 1,000s of uninsured</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>Uninsurance rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid/CHIP</td>
<td>9,535</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketplace subsidy</td>
<td>4,882</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not eligible for Medicaid/CHIP or Marketplace subsidy</td>
<td>16,415</td>
<td>172.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special coverage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid/CHIP-eligible children with uninsured parents</td>
<td>2,258</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>80.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one parent eligible for Medicaid</td>
<td>1,392</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>86.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one parent eligible for Marketplace subsidy, none eligible for Medicaid</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No parent eligible for assistance</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eligible for Medicaid/CHIP or Marketplace subsidy</strong></td>
<td>14,417</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one noncitizen family member</td>
<td>3,301</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All family members are citizens</td>
<td>11,116</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>104.8</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ineligible for Medicaid/CHIP or Marketplace subsidy</strong></td>
<td>16,415</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income is too high</td>
<td>3,219</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family ESI offer</td>
<td>2,283</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration status/length of residency</td>
<td>10,914</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uninsured noncitizens, by age</strong></td>
<td>9,319</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–18</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19–34</td>
<td>4,031</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35–54</td>
<td>3,890</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55–64</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>NATIONAL</td>
<td>Uninsured under Current Law</td>
<td>NEW MEXICO</td>
<td>Uninsured American Indians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,000s of uninsured</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Uninsurance rate (%)</td>
<td>1,000s of uninsured</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Uninsurance rate (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmington, Bloomfield, and Aztec cities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Plains</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe County</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandoval County</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia, Bernalillo East</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountains, and Isleta Pueblo</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doña Ana County</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Southwest</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Urban Institute Health Insurance Policy Simulation Model.
Notes: FPL = federal poverty level. CHIP = Children’s Health Insurance Program. ESI = employer-sponsored insurance. Dashes indicate that data were suppressed for being smaller than 1,000, or no record exists. NA means the category does not apply. Data include those below age 65 not enrolled in Medicare. The upper end of income ranges is not inclusive. For example, $10,000–25,000 includes incomes greater than or equal to $10,000 but less than $25,000. Estimates of workers by major industries and firm size exclude active-duty military members, those unemployed, and those who do not report the industry and size of their employer.
**Race and ethnicity.** American Indians (grouped together with Alaska Natives in census data) have the highest uninsurance rate of any racial and ethnic group in New Mexico (table 1). In 2019, about 16.2 percent of American Indians report being uninsured, totaling about 37,000 people, or one-fifth of all uninsured people in the state. Hispanics are next most likely to be uninsured in New Mexico; 11.9 percent of the state’s Hispanics are uninsured, yet these 105,000 people compose more than half of the uninsured population. Though non-Hispanic whites make up more than a fifth of the uninsured, their uninsurance rate is far lower (6.4 percent). We provide a more detailed analysis of uninsured American Indians in the next section.

**Age.** With an uninsurance rate of 16.2 percent, adults ages 19 to 34 are more likely to be uninsured than other age groups (figure 2). Adults ages 35 to 54 also have a higher-than-average uninsurance rate (12.8 percent). Combined, uninsured people in these two age groups constitute nearly three-quarters of all nonelderly uninsured people in the state (table 1).

**FIGURE 2**
Health Coverage and Uninsurance Rates among Nonelderly New Mexicans, by Age, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Uninsured</th>
<th>Insured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0–18</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19–34</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35–54</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55–64</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total uninsured</td>
<td>187,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Health Insurance Policy Simulation Model.

Note: Data include those below age 65 not enrolled in Medicare. Because 538,000 New Mexicans are from birth to age 18, 453,000 are ages 19 to 34, and 513,000 are ages 35 to 54, the bars representing these groups extend beyond the chart.
Sex. Males are more likely to be uninsured (11.8 percent) than females (9.2 percent).

**Education and English proficiency.** One in four New Mexican adults with less than a high school education is uninsured (table 1). Adults with a high school education report a 14.1 percent uninsurance rate, and those with additional education beyond high school are less likely to be uninsured. Among people who report being less proficient in English, more than one-third (34.4 percent) are uninsured (table 1). As shown in table 2, educational attainment and English proficiency are correlated; among the 40,000 uninsured New Mexican adults with less than a high school education, roughly 60 percent (24,000 people) report not speaking English very well. These factors demonstrate the state’s need for targeted outreach and application assistance. Even among uninsured people with a high school degree or more education, one-sixth still have difficulties with English.

**TABLE 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Proficiency</th>
<th>Less Than High School</th>
<th>High School or Higher</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,000s of people</td>
<td>Share of total</td>
<td>1,000s of people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>uninsured population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaks very well or better</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less proficient</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Urban Institute Health Insurance Policy Simulation Model.

Note: Data include those below age 65 not enrolled in Medicare.

**Employment-Related Characteristics**

**Family work and employer-sponsored insurance offer status.** Employment does not guarantee access to health coverage. An estimated 80 percent of the uninsured are in a family including at least one worker: 58.1 percent of the uninsured are in a family with one full-time worker, an additional 15.9 percent are in a family with more than one full-time worker, and 6.0 percent are in families with part-time workers only. Despite these high levels of participation in the labor force, only 33.1 percent of the uninsured are in families where even one member is offered coverage through an employer.

**Adult employment status, industry, and firm size.** Looking at New Mexico’s uninsured population of employed adults ages 19 to 64, we find that 61.6 percent work full time and another 7.5 percent work
part time (table 1). Those who work in agriculture, construction, and hospitality industries have the highest uninsurance rates of 25.4 percent, 25.4 percent, and 21.4 percent respectively. This pattern holds true at the national level as well. Constituting 43.8 percent of uninsured adult workers, workers employed in small firms (with fewer than 50 employees) are more likely to be uninsured (19.5 percent) than workers in larger firms.

Citizenship. Two-thirds (66.5 percent) of uninsured New Mexicans are US citizens, and 62.9 percent are in families that consist entirely of citizens. Just over half of noncitizens are uninsured. Among people living in a family with at least one noncitizen, 29.4 percent are uninsured.

Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) participation. About 28 percent of the uninsured are in families where at least one person receives SNAP benefits. Among all people in families receiving SNAP benefits, slightly more than 11 percent are uninsured.

Uninsured American Indians

As noted above, we find that American Indians have the highest uninsurance rate (16.2 percent) of any racial/ethnic group in New Mexico; the 37,000 uninsured nonelderly American Indians in New Mexico account for roughly 20 percent of all uninsured nonelderly residents in the state (table 1, third set of columns). More than half of uninsured American Indians live in families with incomes below 138 percent of FPL. American Indians with incomes between 200 and 300 percent of FPL, however, have the highest uninsurance rate (28 percent). Similarly, we find that 57.8 percent of uninsured American Indians are eligible for Medicaid but are not enrolled in the program. Another 21.9 percent are eligible for subsidies in the Marketplace but have not signed up.

American Indian children in New Mexico are at a higher risk of being uninsured (8.6 percent) than the average child in the state (5.5 percent). Nearly 24 percent of American Indians ages 19 to 34, are uninsured, compared with 16 percent of all young adults in New Mexico. Uninsured American Indians are more likely to have completed high school and speak English well, but they are less likely to be working and more likely to be receiving SNAP than uninsured people of all races/ethnicities in New Mexico. More than one-third of uninsured American Indians report receiving SNAP.

Our analysis also reveals that American Indian workers, across all industries, are more likely to be uninsured than all of New Mexico’s workers combined (19.1 percent versus 12.6 percent). Moreover, American Indian workers in wholesale and retail trade, professional and business services, educational
and health services, and public administration have a higher uninsurance rate than those of all workers employed in the same industries.

We also find that the distribution of uninsured American Indian workers by industry differs from that of other uninsured workers in New Mexico. The largest share (27 percent) of uninsured American Indian workers is employed in educational and health services. This is surprising, because workers in this industry have a low uninsurance rate both nationally (6.5 percent) and in New Mexico (7.9 percent). More than twice as many American Indian workers in education and health services are uninsured (17.5 percent) compared with all New Mexican workers in that industry. One-sixth of uninsured American Indian workers, the second largest share, are employed in wholesale and retail trade. Almost one-quarter of such workers are uninsured. This is a much higher uninsurance rate than that of all wholesale and retail workers in the state. Though less than one-tenth of uninsured American Indian workers work in public administration, they are more than three times as likely to be uninsured (13.9 percent) as all New Mexican workers in public administration (4.0 percent). Similar to other uninsured workers in the state, uninsured American Indian workers are highly concentrated in small firms with fewer than 50 employees (where employers are less likely to offer insurance coverage) and the largest firms of more than 1,000 employees (simply because of their large size).

Uninsured American Indians are more likely to live in certain regions of the state. More than half live in Northwest New Mexico, and nearly 14 percent live in Albuquerque. The two areas including (1) Farmington, Bloomfield, and Aztec cities and (2) Sandoval County each contain over 7 percent of the uninsured American Indian population.

**The Uninsured by Eligibility for Medicaid/CHIP and Marketplace Premium Tax Credits**

Figure 3 divides New Mexico residents into categories based on eligibility for Medicaid/CHIP and Marketplace premium tax credits. Just 6.1 percent of the 915,000 nonelderly people eligible for Medicaid or the Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP) are uninsured. In contrast, 29.0 percent of the 148,000 people eligible for Marketplace subsidies are uninsured. About 12 percent of the 721,000 New Mexico residents ineligible for either program are uninsured. The group eligible for Medicaid has the lowest risk of uninsurance of the three eligibility groups, but the group comprises 56,000 people, a large share (30 percent) of the 187,000 uninsured people in the state. The 43,000 people eligible for Marketplace subsidies have the highest risk of uninsurance.
Figure 3
Health Coverage and Uninsurance Rates among Nonelderly New Mexicans, by Eligibility for Medicaid/CHIP and Marketplace Premium Tax Credits, 2019

Source: Urban Institute Health Insurance Policy Simulation Model.
Notes: CHIP = Children’s Health Insurance Program. Data include those below age 65 not enrolled in Medicare. Because 915,000 New Mexicans are eligible for Medicaid/CHIP and 721,000 are ineligible for both Medicaid/CHIP and Marketplace premium tax credits, the bars representing these groups extend beyond the chart.

Thus, most uninsured New Mexico residents (53 percent) are eligible for free or subsidized insurance (figure 4). Almost 30 percent of the uninsured are eligible for Medicaid or CHIP (56,000 people), and more than a fifth (23 percent) are eligible for premium tax credits for private health coverage in the Marketplace (43,000 people). More than one-fifth of the uninsured (40,000 people) are ineligible for subsidies or Medicaid because of their immigration status. Approximately a quarter of uninsured New Mexicans are ineligible for free or subsidized insurance for other reasons; 14 percent have incomes too high to qualify for subsidies and 11 percent have an offer of insurance coverage through their or a family member’s employer deemed affordable according to the ACA that makes them ineligible for subsidies.
As discussed further below, the large share of uninsured New Mexicans eligible for free or subsidized health insurance suggests there may be strategies for policymakers to pursue that would increase awareness of eligibility or ease the enrollment process, potentially reducing uninsurance in the state.

The Uninsured by Substate Region

The number of uninsured people varies significantly across the state, and thus area of residence is another important variable to consider when designing strategies for increasing coverage. A separate supplemental table displays additional detail for the uninsured population in each of 12 substate regions. Figure 5 identifies these 12 regions, the smallest sections of the state we can analyze with our data. About 30 percent of the uninsured (55,000 people) live in Albuquerque (figure 6). The two regions with the next highest shares of the uninsured include Northwest New Mexico (11 percent, or 21,000 people) and Doña Ana County (10 percent, or 19,000 people). Northwest New Mexico also has the highest uninsurance rate at about 16 percent. Figure 7 shows the uninsured share of each region's population.
FIGURE 5
Substate Regions of New Mexico, 2019

Source: Urban Institute Health Insurance Policy Simulation Model.
Note: Data include those below age 65 not enrolled in Medicare.
FIGURE 6
Distribution of 187,000 Uninsured Nonelderly New Mexicans, by Substate Region, 2019

Source: Urban Institute Health Insurance Policy Simulation Model.
Note: Data include those below age 65 not enrolled in Medicare.
Because Hispanic residents account for more than half of the uninsured in New Mexico, we also break down their uninsurance rate by region (figure 8). Santa Fe County, Far Southeast New Mexico, and Eastern Plains have the highest uninsurance rates among Hispanic residents.

Eligibility for free or subsidized health insurance also varies noticeably by region. In Northwest New Mexico, 80 percent of all uninsured people are eligible for Medicaid or CHIP or Marketplace subsidies (figure 9). In the Eastern Plains, 67 percent of all uninsured people are eligible for free or subsidized health coverage, either through Medicaid/CHIP or the Marketplace. More than half of the uninsured are eligible for some assistance program in 7 of the 12 regions.
FIGURE 8
Uninsurance Rates among Nonelderly Hispanic New Mexicans, by Substate Region, 2019

Source: Urban Institute Health Insurance Policy Simulation Model.
Note: Data include those below age 65 not enrolled in Medicare.
Implications for New Mexico Outreach and State Policy

The Uninsured Eligible for Medicaid or CHIP

Only 6.1 percent of New Mexico residents eligible for Medicaid or CHIP are uninsured, indicating that these programs already reach many eligible people. However, if further outreach and enrollment assistance efforts can reach the remainder, such efforts could substantially reduce uninsurance. About 30 percent of all uninsured New Mexicans are eligible for Medicaid or CHIP, as are 58 percent of uninsured American Indians (table 1) and about 57 percent of uninsured children in New Mexico (table 1).
A.1). Given that Medicaid and CHIP coverage are available at no or very low cost, outreach and enrollment efforts targeting these populations have strong potential to increase coverage.

In addition, over half of uninsured New Mexicans (56.4 percent) eligible for Medicaid or CHIP live in households that report SNAP receipt (table A.1). Thus, more fully coordinating Medicaid and SNAP renewal and enrollment could help identify and enroll more eligible uninsured people. In fact, several states already have such initiatives in place, and they could serve as models for New Mexico (Wagner and Huguelet 2016).

The Uninsured Eligible for Marketplace Premium Tax Credits

At 29 percent, the uninsurance rate for those eligible for premium tax credits is several times higher than the uninsurance rate for those eligible for Medicaid and CHIP (table A.1). This differential likely owes to several factors, including the higher household cost associated with subsidized Marketplace coverage, lower awareness of eligibility, and greater complexity involved in enrolling in and choosing a Marketplace plan. Though affordability remains an issue for some, greater outreach and enrollment assistance could help increase Marketplace coverage. A combination of the following state policies could maximize coverage: additional targeted outreach and enrollment assistance, supplemental premium tax credits and/or cost-sharing assistance, and a state individual mandate.

The Uninsured Ineligible for Financial Assistance

One quarter of uninsured New Mexicans either have incomes too high to qualify for financial assistance or are disqualified for premium tax credits because they or a family member have been offered coverage deemed affordable under the ACA (figure 4). One way to increase enrollment among those ineligible for financial assistance is to reduce unsubsidized premiums in the nongroup market, and a growing number of states have implemented reinsurance programs to do so. Also, a state individual mandate would reverse any adverse selection into the insurance pool caused by the loss of the federal mandate. Another option is extending state-funded premium tax credits to groups ineligible for the federal credits.
Methods

We used the Urban Institute’s Health Insurance Policy Simulation Model to provide estimates of the detailed characteristics of New Mexico’s uninsured population under age 65. HIPSM is based on a large, representative sample of the US population. The data underlying the model are drawn from two merged years of the American Community Survey (ACS) and consist of more than 6 million observations nationally. These data enable HIPSM to produce reliable, state-representative estimates. HIPSM has a large sample size for New Mexico, composed of about 40,000 original ACS observations. For 2019, the model aligns to the latest available enrollment data for Medicaid and qualified health plans in each state.

We project New Mexico’s population in 2019 using estimates from the University of New Mexico’s Geospatial and Population Studies. Specifically, we started with the population and age distribution of New Mexico in the 2017 ACS and with comparable 2020 projections from the University of New Mexico. We then estimated the 2019 population by linear interpolation between the two.

The superiority of using a microsimulation model rather than survey data for this analysis is three-fold. First, we can reliably project the survey data a few years into the future using information from demographers on expected population growth. This projection results in more timely and useful estimates for policymakers. Second, we edit and align key variables in the survey data to better match more accurate sources of information. For example, we align the insurance coverage reported in the ACS with administrative enrollment data by total and critical subtotals. This is important because the distribution of enrollment by type of Medicaid eligibility can affect the characteristics of the uninsured. For example, Medicaid and CHIP are crucial programs for children’s coverage, so seemingly small differences in child Medicaid/CHIP enrollment between a survey and administrative data can affect the calculation of children’s uninsurance rates. Third, we build detailed models based on current laws and regulations to calculate individuals’ eligibility for Medicaid and Marketplace subsidies. No survey includes data on eligibility for assistance that people do not report receiving. This permits us to estimate the number of uninsured people eligible for but not enrolled in programs that could provide them with free or subsidized insurance coverage. Thus, HIPSM yields powerful and useful information for policymakers seeking to better understand the characteristics of their uninsured population.

As noted, the standard HIPSM model incorporates publicly available data on Medicaid and Marketplace enrollment in each state. For this analysis, we customized the model based on detailed enrollment information provided by New Mexico and estimates of the number of uninsured New
Mexicans in the latest available census surveys. Specifically, we customized HIPSM for New Mexico based on the following:

- Medicaid and CHIP enrollment by detailed eligibility type for the nonelderly, including people with disabilities, Medicaid expansion adults, parents and caretaker adults, and nondisabled children, focusing on those eligible for full benefits, rather than waivers that only cover certain services
- per capita costs of Medicaid/CHIP enrollees by the aforementioned eligibility types
- Medicaid enrollment among American Indians
- Marketplace enrollees by receipt of premium tax credits and cost-sharing reductions
- the distribution of Marketplace enrollees by age and sex
- the number of uninsured New Mexicans from the latest year of the ACS for which edits from the Integrated Public Use Microdata Series and our edits are available (2017); based on changes in Medicaid and marketplace enrollment since 2017, we estimate that the number of uninsured New Mexicans in 2019 should be between 185,000 and 196,000, and our calibrated model has 187,000

The ACS is designed to produce statistically valid estimates down to local areas called public use microdata areas (PUMAs), which have roughly the same population. New Mexico has 18 PUMAs, and we used them to define 12 regions within New Mexico that correspond with major cities, counties, or groups of counties. Albuquerque is split into six PUMAs, which we combined. One PUMA, which combines the cities of Farmington, Bloomfield, and Aztec, does not follow county boundaries. However, the characteristics of residents in this PUMA are notably different from those in surrounding regions in ways that affect this analysis, so we kept this PUMA separate.

Conclusion

At 10.5 percent, New Mexico’s uninsurance rate is lower than the national average. Uninsurance rates are especially low among the lowest-income residents, many of whom are eligible for and enrolled in Medicaid. But, 187,000 residents remain uninsured. American Indians have the highest uninsurance rate relative to other racial and ethnic groups, but Hispanics make up more than half of the state’s uninsured population. Additionally, more than half of the uninsured are eligible for Medicaid, CHIP, or subsidized coverage in the Marketplace. These estimates highlight opportunities to increase coverage in New Mexico.
Appendix A. Characteristics of Nonelderly Uninsured New Mexicans, by Eligibility for Free or Subsidized Health Insurance

**TABLE A.1**
Characteristics of the Nonelderly Uninsured in New Mexico, by Eligibility for Medicaid/CHIP and Marketplace Subsidies, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eligible for Medicaid/CHIP</th>
<th>Eligible for Marketplace Subsidy</th>
<th>Ineligible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,000s of uninsured</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Uninsurance rate (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modified adjusted gross income as a percentage of FPL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;= 138% FPL</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139–200% FPL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200–400% FPL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 400%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjusted gross income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; $1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1–10,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000–25,000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000–50,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000–75,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000–100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic white</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic black</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eligible for Medicaid/CHIP</td>
<td>Eligible for Marketplace Subsidy</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,000s of uninsured</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Uninsurance rate (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19–34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35–54</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55–64</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English proficiency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaks English very well or better</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not speak English very well or is less proficient</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No workers</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only part-time worker(s)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One full-time worker</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one full-time worker</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not working</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employer offer for health coverage in the family</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No offer</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one family member has an employer coverage offer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major industry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, forestry, fishing, and hunting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible for Medicaid/CHIP</td>
<td>Eligible for Marketplace Subsidy</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000s of uninsured</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Uninsurance rate (%)</td>
<td>1,000s of uninsured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>- NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>- NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>- NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>- NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1 12.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>6 18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale and retail trade</td>
<td>1 11.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5 15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and utilities</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>- NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>- NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>- NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial activities</td>
<td>- NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and business services</td>
<td>- NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational and health services</td>
<td>1 9.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and hospitality</td>
<td>4 29.8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>4 13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services</td>
<td>2 14.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>2 6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration</td>
<td>- NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm size</td>
<td>9 100.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>26 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–49 people</td>
<td>3 36.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>16 62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–99 people</td>
<td>- NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1 4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100–499 people</td>
<td>- NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2 9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500–999 people</td>
<td>- NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>- NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000+ people</td>
<td>3 39.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5 20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US citizen</td>
<td>38 68.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>42 97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncitizen</td>
<td>18 31.5</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>1 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All US citizens</td>
<td>35 63.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>40 93.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one noncitizen</td>
<td>20 36.6</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>3 6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family SNAP receipt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No SNAP receipt</td>
<td>24 43.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>34 80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one family member receives SNAP</td>
<td>32 56.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reported health status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All noneelderly New Mexicans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>13 23.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>11 25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>12 21.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>14 33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>19 34.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>13 31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eligible for Medicaid/CHIP</td>
<td>Eligible for Marketplace Subsidy</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,000s of uninsured</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>Uninsurance rate (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nonelderly New Mexicans, excluding children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geography</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmington, Bloomfield, and Aztec cities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Plains</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe County</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandoval County</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia, Bernalillo East Mountains, and Isleta Pueblo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doña Ana County</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Southwest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far Southeast</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Urban Institute. Health Insurance Policy Simulation Model.

**Notes:** CHIP = Children’s Health Insurance Program. FPL = federal poverty level. Dashes indicate that data were suppressed for being smaller than 1,000, or no record exists. NA means the category does not apply. Data include those below age 65 not enrolled in Medicare. The upper end of income ranges is not inclusive. For example, $10,000–$25,000 includes incomes greater than or equal to $10,000 but less than $25,000. Estimates of workers by major industries and firm size exclude active-duty military members or those unemployed; firm size estimates exclude additional workers who do not report firm size.
Notes

1 Family income by FPL adjusts for family size. For example, the FPL for a single adult is lower than that for a family of multiple people. Family income by adjusted gross income does not adjust for family size, but these statistics provide useful reference points for policymakers. People with negative adjusted gross incomes are displayed in their own group; in many cases, these individuals and families have business losses and would otherwise have middle incomes.

2 The supplemental table is available at https://www.urban.org/research/publication/uninsured-new-mexico/characteristics-of-the-nonelderly-uninsured-new-mexico-puma-groups.
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