COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE HEARING BUDGET HEARING

STATE CAPITOL
MAJORITY CAUCUS ROOM
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

TUESDAY, MARCH 4, 2008, 1:00 P.M.

VOLUME III OF V

PRESENTATION BY
DEPARTMENT OF INSURANCE

BEFORE:

HONORABLE DWIGHT EVANS, CHAIRMAN

HONORABLE MARIO J. CIVERA, JR., CHAIRMAN

HONORABLE STEPHEN E. BARRAR

HONORABLE STEVEN W. CAPPELLI

HONORABLE H. SCOTT CONKLIN

HONORABLE CRAIG A. DALLY

HONORABLE GORDON R. DENLINGER

HONORABLE BRIAN ELLIS

HONORABLE DAN B. FRANKEL

HONORABLE JOHN T. GALLOWAY

HONORABLE WILLIAM F. KELLER

HONORABLE THADDEUS KIRKLAND

HONORABLE BRYAN R. LENTZ

HONORABLE KATHY M. MANDERINO

HONORABLE MICHAEL P. McGEEHAN

HONORABLE FRED McILHATTAN

HONORABLE DAVID R. MILLARD

HONORABLE RON MILLER

HONORABLE JOHN MYERS

HONORABLE CHERELLE PARKER

HONORABLE JOSEPH A. PETRARCA

```
1
    BEFORE: (cont.'d)
       HONORABLE SCOTT A. PETRI
 2
       HONORABLE SEAN M. RAMALEY
       HONORABLE DAVE REED
 3
       HONORABLE DOUGLAS G. REICHLEY
       HONORABLE DANTE SANTONI, JR.
 4
       HONORABLE MARIO M. SCAVELLO
       HONORABLE JOSHUA D. SHAPIRO
 5
       HONORABLE JOHN SIPTROTH
       HONORABLE MATTHEW SMITH
 6
       HONORABLE KATIE TRUE
       HONORABLE GREGORY S. VITALI
7
       HONORABLE DON WALKO
       HONORABLE JAKE WHEATLEY, JR.
 8
9
    ALSO PRESENT:
       MIRIAM FOX
10
       EDWARD NOLAN
11
12
                                JEAN M. DAVIS, REPORTER
                                NOTARY PUBLIC
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1			I N D E X	
2			TESTIFIERS	
3				
4	NAMES			PAGE
5	ACTING	COMMISSIONER	JOEL ARIO	4
6	DEPUTY	COMMISSIONER	GEORGE HOOVER	41
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

```
1
            REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: We will get started
2
    now.
            Thank you for coming. What we'll do is we
3
4
    will have your prepared remarks submitted for the
5
    record, and we usually just start right with
6
    questioning.
7
            ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: That will be
    fine.
8
            REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: All right.
9
10
            Chairman Civera, please.
11
            CHAIRMAN CIVERA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
            Welcome.
12
13
            ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Thank you.
            CHAIRMAN CIVERA: Commissioner, in the last
14
    6 or 7 weeks the Legislature has had a lot of debate
15
    with the Mcare Fund. And I've been here for 28 years
16
    and have had different situations where the doctors
17
    would address that so their insurance rates wouldn't
18
    go off the wall.
19
20
            And for the last couple of years with the
    cigarette tax, it has worked. It has given them some
21
22
    type of a comfort level trying to keep them in
23
    Pennsylvania.
24
            The Governor now has extended that into the
25
    end of March, and these doctors need -- and it's not
```

about, you know, saying a political statement of protecting the doctor. The real need is here. We can't in any way try to alarm the public as far as the medical people themselves.

So after the end of March, do you believe that the Governor is going to extend that, or are we going to use this as some type of leverage so the General Assembly does what the Governor wants us to do? Because the real purpose of this whole issue was to protect the doctors from the high cost of insurance as far as where they were and basically, at that time, to keep them in Pennsylvania.

So could you give us some idea of what happens, I mean, at the end of March and where we could go with this?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative, thank you for that question, because I know that's on the mind of a lot of people here.

The Governor shares your concern for the medical malpractice insurance market. And as you say, it's for the doctors, but it is more importantly for the patients for a stable system.

So the Governor, as you know, has been on record supporting the abatement program from the beginning. In fact, his proposal that is on the

table with the Legislature would extend the abatement program for 10 years.

But he has said something else which I think is very important, and that is that there's another problem facing the Commonwealth of equal necessity, and that's the number of uninsured people that continue to have day-to-day problems accessing health care.

And he has looked at the numbers and the Budget Secretary has looked at the numbers, and a number of us have looked at them, and determined that there is money available both to extend the abatement program and to do something significant for the uninsured here in Pennsylvania.

That is the Governor's objective. I stand ready, as a member of the Cabinet, to work with the Legislature wherever and whenever the Legislature desires to try to accomplish that goal.

As to what happens at the end of March, the status quo is that doctors have been billed their full assessments, and those bills are due March 31. And I understand some doctors are already paying those bills.

So if we don't reach resolution in the Legislature very soon, the most likely scenario is

that the bills will be due, paid, and then we are in a position to grant refunds. We have the process in motion here to be able to very quickly refund money if and when the Legislature passes an abatement program. So that is the stated plan.

And again I'll reinforce that both the medical malpractice market and the broader health insurance market need changed, need some new resources, and we stand ready to work with the Legislature, the General Assembly, at whatever point you are available to try to solve both problems.

CHAIRMAN CIVERA: Your statement, if and when the Legislature decides to pass this legislation -- if and when the Legislature -- so if the Legislature wants to do one thing but the Governor wants something else, these medical professionals now are held hostage.

And the intent of the legislation from the very beginning when we came out with the cigarette tax to help with their insurance was to help them at that point in time. That's what the General Assembly's intentions were and that's what the Governor at that time, what his intentions were.

And now, we are -- believe me, don't get me off on the wrong side here -- I believe that as far

as the insurance issue with constituents and with the public of Pennsylvania, they need to be protected.

But at the same time, what was good for everybody

or 6 years ago, now, right now, we're playing in a different playing field, and I don't believe that

that's really fair.

Bills have went out. Doctors didn't receive those bills last year. They didn't receive those bills that they had to be paid by March the 31st.

And now all of a sudden we now turn the whole clock around because we have an agenda that we want to fulfill.

You can fulfill that agenda, the

Legislature, I'm sure -- and that's a negotiable

item, bipartisan item -- as well as the Governor's

Office, but it can't be that it's either my way or no

way and then you have these people out here that are

being held hostage. That's just not a fair solution.

Now, you might not agree with that, but I just believe that this situation, the doctors should have kept where they were and you still could have dealt with it, and the doctors wouldn't have resented it, not for one minute.

So now what I hear is, March 31, bingo, you got to pay this dollar amount, and if we pass it and

we get a compromise, we'll give you a refund. That's
what I'm hearing. Am I correct?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative, that's correct, unless -- and I still hold myself out for hope. I've seen legislative processes move rather quickly. I believe this one could be moved quickly enough to avoid that scenario.

And let me say one other thing, because I think it is important. I'm listening very carefully to what you're saying, and I recognize, as a new Commissioner here, that there are many different opinions in this General Assembly, and I respect them all.

I think the Governor is flexible on this issue. I've watched the Governor start with his fair share assessment and I watched him out on the stump talk about how important that was and how if we don't have a fair share assessment, we really are going to continue to see deterioration in the employer-based coverage market. I think he's absolutely right about that.

But when he saw the writing on the wall that that was not politically doable in the General Assembly, he moved off of a position that he held with passion and he moved to this second position,

which is, there is enough money now in the Health

Care Provider Retention Account to both do the

abatements and deal with the uninsured.

So that is a very flexible position, and if you're asking whether there could be continued flexibility, I know there are discussions going on in this building every day about plans C, D, and E.

While there are many different ways to do this, I don't think the Governor has one way. But he is committed, as I've seen him, to the notion that we need to address both the medical malpractice market and the health insurance market together.

CHAIRMAN CIVERA: How much is the refund going to cost?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative, do you mean the administrative costs associated with the refund?

CHAIRMAN CIVERA: When you go to give -- no. If we pass the legislation, you said you're going to present a refund to the doctors. What's that going to cost? Has that been thought about, or is that another item that we're going to have to deal with later down the road?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative, it has been thought about. There would be two costs

there, obviously.

One would be the cost of the refund itself, which would be the level of abatement. If it were at prior levels, that would be in excess of \$100 million. But that would be funded as it has been in the past, presumably through the cigarette tax.

The administrative costs of the refund are not terribly significant. They're relatively minor costs against that cost. So there's not an issue or a problem with that procedure.

Again, I don't want to get too far off on the refund process, that's what happens if we can't reach an agreement. But there still is every desire on the part of the Administration to reach the agreement.

CHAIRMAN CIVERA: Okay. And then I'm going to leave; I'm not going to belabor the point.

The issue here is that by March the 31st, they have to pay that insurance fee, and now if we don't pass some type of an Mcare situation where the insurance is covered with what the Governor wants to do, now you just said on the record that there will be a refund and we're not really sure exactly what that's going to cost and how that's going to fit into

1 the mix. 2 Now, if we did anything right now, you and I with our dialogue, we really confused everybody, 3 4 because now they don't know where to be. They know they have got to pay it. They don't know what the 5 refund is. Then you come back to us as far as the 6 7 dollar amount as far as the refund is concerned, so that's not a good situation. 8 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 9 10 REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Thank you, Chairman 11 Civera. 12 The majority Chairman of the Insurance 13 Committee, Representative Tony DeLuca, please. 14 REPRESENTATIVE DeLUCA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 15 16 Welcome, Mr. Commissioner. 17 ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Good to be here -- I think. 18 19 REPRESENTATIVE DeLUCA: Mr. Commissioner, 20 last year in November, myself and my counterpart, Representative Micozzie, reported out House Bill 21 22 2005, which provides for the reform of this small 23 group market in Pennsylvania. 24 ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Okay. 25 REPRESENTATIVE DeLUCA: I would like to hear your opinion today regarding why small group rating reform is important to any health-care coverage plan, including the Governor's Rx for Pennsylvania, and also why you think Pennsylvania is one of only two States in the nation without reform in this area.

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Okay. Thank you for that question.

I think small group reform is absolutely an essential part of the overall Prescription for Pennsylvania program, because it addresses the part of the employer-based market that is most vulnerable today.

If you think about how health insurance works, most people get it through their employer. And for most people, that's a large employer, where there's a large pool within that particular workplace. So you have some healthy people, hopefully a lot of healthy people, maybe a few sick people, that pool together. There's a stability of rating; there's the spreading of risk, and that part of the market is the most successful.

And if you look at the statistics, you see that for large employers, virtually all of them continue to provide health coverage. If you get over 5,000 employees, almost every employer -- Wal-Mart

stood out for awhile as the one large employer in the country that didn't provide health insurance. But as you go down the scale there into the smaller employers, you see a lot more difficulty, a lot more employers struggling to provide coverage. It's an affordability issue, the same as everybody else has. So some of that is that basic affordability, but some of it is the lack of stability in that market.

In fact, we went out and did a series of hearings this fall, and we heard from a lot of small employers where one single employee had a major medical episode, and that was enough to dramatically impact the group's rates, potentially even drive them off of the ability to afford insurance.

Or they're thinking about hiring a new worker, and they have to take into account, well, we have a young workforce now; if we hire this person who may be a little older, how will that affect our health rates? A single person or a couple people dramatically affect the rates.

That's why in every State except two,

Pennsylvania and Hawaii -- and then we have to throw

in the District of Columbia here, too -- their

Legislatures have taken action to pass laws that

essentially require the pooling of risk in that small

group market so that it behaves more like the large group markets.

So you don't have each employer of 5 or 10 people as it's own separate rating pool. You have all of those people pooled together, and they behave as a larger small group pool, much like a large employer does. That's what we're trying to accomplish.

The bill that you referenced, 2005, I think is an admirable attempt to wrestle with that problem. As you know, the Governor still has a slightly different position on the issue, but I think, again, there's flexibility here.

And if there needs to be some compromises on all sides to get a small group reform bill through this Legislature, I think it's an absolutely imperative reform, and I'm hoping we can get that done this year.

REPRESENTATIVE DeLUCA: Well, I was proud of the fact that this bill came out bipartisan, and certainly myself and my counterpart on the Republican side have been working on small group reform for years. As a matter of fact, when he was the majority Chairman, he had numerous hearings on it to eventuate some type of small group reform.

1 So I'm glad to hear your position on that, 2 and I want to thank you. And certainly I believe we will be able to move this legislation, because I 3 think it's critical for our small businesses that we 4 move this type of legislation. 5 So again, thank you, Mr. Chairman. 6 7 ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: I should note for the record, Representative Micozzie was at the first 8 of those hearings down in his district and was a 9 10 great contributor that day. 11 REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Well, that's a great 12 lead-in to the promoter of bipartisanship, the 13 minority Chairman of the Insurance Committee. REPRESENTATIVE MICOZZIE: My friend, 14 Representative DeLuca, used to call me friend before; 15 16 now he calls me a counterpart. REPRESENTATIVE DeLUCA: He's still my 17 friend. 18 19 REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Representative Nick 2.0 Micozzie. 21 REPRESENTATIVE MICOZZIE: You know, on 22 House Bill 2005, if I remember correctly, Rosemarie Greco during, I guess it was a hearing, had 23 24 said there was a report that had come out on small 25 group reform. If I remember correctly, I think it

was community rating and all that. I have never seen the report, or none of us had seen the report or have received the report.

Is there such a report? And I'm not questioning Rosemarie, because I like Rosemarie. But is there such a report, do you know?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative, we've worked up a number of different analyses. We have not put them into a specific report, but I can talk to you -- I think you're probably referring to information on the cost savings associated with the reforms.

REPRESENTATIVE MICOZZIE: Yes.

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: I can speak to that, and we can provide some of that detail to you in writing.

As you might guess, when you're dealing with a reform this broad, there are a number of different aspects to it, and one of the things we have been trying to do is get actuaries to pinpoint these cost savings for us. And that has proven difficult, because there are a lot of different variables in play.

But my own staff has taken a look at these issues and determined that if we passed the reform in

the Governor's format -- and it's pretty close to the bill that Representative DeLuca, Chairman DeLuca, referenced -- that there would be savings of around \$2,000 on a \$9,000 policy.

Most of that is related to the broader cost-cutting measures that this Legislature has already taken on, so hospital infections -- this Legislature I commend for being early on in that process -- the Chronic Care Commission, looking at the medical error rates.

There are a number of aspects of reform that the General Assembly has moved on, and those account for about a 15-percent overall savings, as we calculated, in the small group market.

The specific reform that's within the small group bill that will save the most money is the requirement of an 85-percent medical loss ratio.

That means that out of every dollar paid in health-care premiums, 85 cents should go back to the policyholder in the form of claims payments.

The rest of the reforms, frankly, people would like to find a free lunch here that you can stabilize the market, cover everybody, and everybody saves money, but that part of the reform doesn't work that way. What it does is just like a large

employer: It saves money and stabilizes rates overall, but some people who are the most healthy pay a little bit more in order that some people who are less healthy, that need the insurance more, pay a little bit less.

2.0

So that part of the reform essentially in our analysis is a wash. It's more about stability and predictability of rates.

But overall, again, with the cost-cutting measures plus the medical loss ratio, you'd be dealing with something approaching a 20-percent reduction, something like \$2,000 on a \$9,000 policy.

REPRESENTATIVE MICOZZIE: First of all, I'd like to thank you for inviting me to your hearing down at the hospital. It was a very informative hearing.

The modified community rating which was proposed during that 2005, or whatever hearings we had, is that still part of the reform package?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative, yes, it is.

I think the essential aspects of the reform are to limit the rating factors that can be considered when you're looking at a small group so that you're looking at common demographic factors

like age, sex is a disputable one -- I think that's in some of the bills, not in some of the other bills -- type of industry, and so forth.

And then secondly, in addition to restricting that, the most important restriction there for the Governor and for me is you can't look at medical factors there. Those are the things that cause the rates to gyrate up and down. You cannot look at medical factors. Take those out.

The second level of reform is, how much variation is there between groups, and that's the rate banning or modified community rating that you referenced. In the Governor's bill, that's a two-to-one rate ban. In Chairman DeLuca's bill, it's a two-to-one rate ban for some and a three-to-one rate ban for others.

Again, we're going to get down in the weeds here pretty quickly in terms of these details, but what's important there is that you're compressing rates so that there's stability and predictability.

And the group today that says, gee, that's not such a good idea because we benefit by being at the low end of that continuum, tomorrow that group may have somebody who would put them at the top end.

So in the long run, it's in everybody's

interest to have that stability and predictability.

REPRESENTATIVE MICOZZIE: Four or five years ago, we -- we, I'm talking about the Insurance Committee, which included Chairman Colafella, Chairman DeLuca, and myself, and the Insurance Committee, members of the Insurance Committee -- on a bipartisan endeavor, reformed the CAT Fund, which became the Mcare with Act 13.

I think it's so very important that we do away with this unfunded liability. There seems to be some question by the Administration of whether to do that or use the auto CAT money surplus to do other things.

I hope that's not the case, because I think, because we did all the reforms that we put in place, the insurance companies are coming back into Pennsylvania, and there has been a stabilization as far as liability and whatever.

So can you just give me some insight on what the Administration is thinking on what to do with the CAT Fund? Or Mcare.

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative, I can tell you that no one wants to get rid of the Mcare program as much as me, because I look at the resources that our department devotes to that and

think about all the other regulatory priorities that could be addressed if we had those resources for other purposes.

So that is very high on my personal agenda and it is high on the Governor's agenda. And the proposals that he's made so far to combine the issue of the uninsured with solving the Mcare problems always include phasing out the Mcare unfunded liability and going back to a private market solution. So I believe that's the right way to go.

Now, I do have to tell you that I've heard discussion in the building about trying to do more on the uninsured side with credits for currently covered employers and so forth, and depending on how much money gets spent there, there are trade-offs then against the Mcare Fund.

But the Governor's proposals that are on the table do envision the phasing out of Mcare and the return to a private market. And certainly we've done major improvement. The bill that you worked on in 2002 that you referenced has succeeded.

So 5 years ago we were looking at 30-,
40-percent rate increases; today we're looking at the
two largest medical malpractice insurers decreasing
their rates.

We're looking at a level number of doctors in the State. We're looking at Mcare claims that were approaching \$400 million a year only 5 years ago, now under \$200 million a year.

So there has been tremendous progress there, and we do have a moment in time here an opportunity, I believe, to phase that program out and to return to a more normal market approach to medical malpractice.

REPRESENTATIVE MICOZZIE: If I remember correctly -- and I think it's still in place -- there is a provision in Act 13 which allows the Commissioner to make a determination to start privatizing. Is that still part of the law?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative, that's correct.

The next time that decision would face me -there was a decision just prior to my coming on the
scene. The next decision point under current law is
in 2009, and that decision would be whether to go
from the current \$500,000 first layer covered in the
private sector to a first layer in the private sector
up to \$750,000.

I know there has been talk in the General
Assembly, particularly, I think, on the Senate side,
about having the ramp-ups occur in a more graduated

fashion, so maybe \$50,000 or \$100,000 at a pop. I think there's real merit in that idea. It ought to be looked at, and it may be easier to ramp-up on a gradual pace like that -- less disruption in the market and so forth.

A \$250,000 jump at one time is a bit daunting. And there still are -- again, I don't want to get down in the weeds here -- but there still are issues that I'm concerned with in the medical malpractice arena, particularly around risk-retention groups having a much more major role than they did back when the market was in better shape.

REPRESENTATIVE MICOZZIE: And last but not least, of course, is the abatement. I had the occasion yesterday to go to an ophthalmologist -- a surgeon, an ophthalmologist. And, of course, when I walked in, they started bending my ear about abatement and whatever, but he pointed out the amount of surgeons in the Delaware County area of that discipline, you know, a surgeon.

I was amazed, on the three-State area he was talking about -- he was very knowledgeable -- of the lack of these types of professionals. And I'm not just talking about a plain old ophthalmologist; we're talking about an ophthalmologist that does surgery on

the eye and that type thing. And then, of course, I have some friends who are physicians, doctors. About the abatement, I think that abatement program is essential to continue to try to keep the professionals in Pennsylvania, because that abatement program helps them to pay that liability insurance that has been dogging them for the last 10 years or whatever.

So are we on the right track as far as the abatement? I mean, there seems to be rumor around that the Governor is not too hyped, I'll call it, on the abatement. Is that true or false?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Absolutely false.

I've heard the Governor speak on this issue again very passionately. He points out that he had a joint press conference with former Governor Schweiker before he even took office to talk about putting in place an abatement program.

He has always championed that abatement program. And indeed, his proposal on a go-forward basis for the first time is, let's not do it year to year; let's have a 10-year renewal of it.

The only thing that the Governor does do -and I know it's a source of consternation to some
here -- is to say that that's not the only priority

```
1
    for the Legislature and the health-care arena and
2
    that he thinks doing something with the uninsured is
3
    an equally important priority. So he links the two,
4
    and that causes some people to be unhappy.
 5
            But trust me, it is not an intention to do
    in the abasement program. It's intended to deal with
6
7
    both problems together.
            REPRESENTATIVE MICOZZIE: Thank you very
8
    much.
9
10
            Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
11
            REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Thank you.
12
            The minority Chairman of the Consumer
13
    Affairs Committee, Representative Bob Godshall.
14
            REPRESENTATIVE GODSHALL: Thank you,
    Mr. Chairman.
15
            Good afternoon.
16
17
            ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Good afternoon.
            REPRESENTATIVE GODSHALL: I'm going to be
18
19
    quoting sort of from a study that was developed by
20
    the National Conference of Insurance Legislators, a
21
    body that numerous people here in this room belong
22
    to, members of the Insurance Committee.
23
            And basically the study was done because of
24
    concerns that were developed out of NAIC, the
    National Association of Insurance Commissioners, and
25
```

they used really closed-door meetings and closed-door sessions at your meetings.

And I do want to quote from -- one of the reasons for the study was the legal authority behind primary oversight of insurance and related consumer protections, the statutory authorities and responsibilities granted to Legislators, executive and judicial branch members, and regulatory organizations, among others.

Studies regarding the evolution and funding of regulatory entities, recommendations to clarify and define the role of such entities, and their oversight duties in order to promote an effective and efficient regulatory environment, really based on what was once a policy committee or a regulatory committee, is now totally almost dwelling in the policy realm, which many of us feel really is the realm of the Legislators rather than the regulators.

And I guess a case in point is just recently, a Life Settlements Model Act was passed by NCOIL, the National Conference of Insurance Legislators. A similar Life Settlements Model Act was also passed by NAIC, the National Association of Insurance Commissioners.

We passed the model act. You passed the

model act. One of the major differences was, ours was done in the open, totally open meetings. Anybody can go to an NCOIL meeting. They're all open to the public and open to anybody who is there. Yours was basically passed in closed, secret, or whatever meetings.

You know, I'm not sure what's happening here, but a lot of us feel that are active with the Insurance Committee that the NAIC is just overstepping their bounds.

And I guess a case in point also is the development of the NAIC over the years. The NAIC today has a budget which exceeds \$62 million, has approximately 400 or more employees -- and I'm not sure what they all do -- and we pay, I guess at the State level, \$100,000 a year, approximately \$100,000 a year, as our assessment, plus the insurance companies that operate within the State, you know, are also paying a fairly substantial amount of money to NAIC to develop that \$60-some million surplus that really remains now in the coffers of the NAIC.

Again, we're not the only ones that are complaining. In a memo that I got dated May 29, 2007, it says, "NAIC officials met in executive session this spring to develop the procedure in an

effort to increase the likelihood that new models really will shape State laws and regulations. The NAIC Executive Committee, meeting in executive session, will have to determine that the issues that are subject to the model requirements meet national standards" and so forth.

And then "Consumer representatives have concerns about the use of executive sessions to develop NAIC model law approval procedures according to..." and so forth and so on. You know, it's a matter of regulation versus policy.

And then at the same time, back in 2004, investigations by then Attorney General and now Governor Eliot Spitzer in New York in competitive acts by insurance brokers, that was handled by the Attorney General's Office, and where were the insurance commissioners, you know, on the regulatory process?

You know, that's what I'm saying. We have become, instead of being a regulatory, we've become a policy committee with millions and millions of dollars in budgets and in surpluses. You know, is this what it was meant to be when this was first formulated?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative ---

REPRESENTATIVE GODSHALL: And I know you were a part of this organization, and I did share these comments with you in advance.

2.0

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative, thank you for those questions.

You and I have had one chance to talk about NCOIL and the NAIC, and I say we probably need at least one or two or three more chances maybe. So you said a lot of things there. Let me try to address some of the points that you made.

REPRESENTATIVE GODSHALL: If I may interject.

Some of our members have gone to your meetings. Some of the members of different State insurance committees have gone to your meetings, and they have been denied access to the meetings.

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative, that absolutely should not happen, and I'd be happy to follow up on any specifics that way.

Let me say a couple of things, though, because you did make a number of important points, and I think they deserve discussion here.

The first point, NAIC versus NCOIL; regular role versus legislative role. Your current Chairman, Brian Kennedy, and I have become good friends. It

came out of an initial exchange between us in an NCOIL hearing.

I used to go to every NCOIL meeting for about 3 years when the NAIC and NCOIL worked together to produce, I think, a very good market conduct reform act, and NAIC and NCOIL still work together on a lot of the models. And the example you cited, I think those models are complimentary to each other.

Anyway, his point to me that day when we had the exchange was, I'm the legislator; you're the regulator. We set the rules; you execute and implement the rules. I believe that's absolutely correct.

The one thing that sometimes comes into play here, and you referenced it, is that as the regulator, I believe it is my job to bring forward policy recommendations, policy options, for the consideration of the Legislature.

But you absolutely are in the driver's seat in terms of setting insurance policy. Our role is to implement the policies and to make recommendations where appropriate for your consideration. And so I'm quite clear on that with Brian Kennedy, who I think wrote the report that you're referencing there.

The second issue. You made reference to the

NAIC's \$62 million budget. It is a large, well-resourced organization. The reason it's that way is because the insurance industry wants it that way because insurance is regulated at the State level, and being regulated at the State level, there are multiple concerns about coordination and consistency and even uniformity between the States.

2.0

So we have a financial accreditation program today that takes the lion's share of that \$62 million budget where all insurance companies in this country, many of whom are licensed in every State, file one place with their financial data electronically every year.

Just this week, my financial guy was in the other room working on some annual statements, and I said, we don't get annual statements from everybody here in Pennsylvania anymore, do we? Most States have dispensed with that. And he said, so have we; we don't require the companies to file here except the domestic ones because we use the NAIC system.

And there's tremendous gains to the State regulatory system, which, as you know, NCOIL is every bit as strong as the NAIC and maybe even stronger for saying that needs to stay at the State level. The reason it will stay at the State level is because of

the uniformity and coordination that the NAIC brings to bear.

Just a couple more points on the open versus closed meetings. We have very few closed meetings at the NAIC. Some of them that were closed should have been open. That issue was brought forward by NCOIL, and there now are more open meetings. Many that they pointed to that used to be closed are now open.

There are going to always be some closed meetings. We discuss companies that are either in financial difficulty or subject to regulatory action where there is very confidential information. Some of that does have to be closed.

But we've created, much at NCOIL's behest, a new committee at the NAIC that combines insurance regulators and Legislators and meets on a regular basis.

I think if you checked with your current president, Brian Kennedy from Rhode Island, he would tell you that there has been marked improvement in all these areas. I know that's what he tells me. I shared a podium with him recently.

And then the last issue, I have to respond, because I was very involved in the issue with Attorney General Spitzer and the bid rigging and that

sort of thing.

The New York Insurance Department started that issue. Attorney General Spitzer -- then Attorney General Spitzer -- took it up, too, and the only reason that people think he did all the work and the insurance regulators did not is because he is much better at the media game than the insurance regulators are. We just do our work and get it done.

And if you talk to him today, he works hand in glove with his insurance regulator, and he will tell you that the insurance regulators were very much a part of that action even though he got most of the credit.

REPRESENTATIVE GODSHALL: I appreciate the time, and I appreciate your responses.

I just want to call, you know, one thing to your attention: "NAIC officials met in executive session this spring to develop the procedure in an effort to increase the likelihood of a new model act..." and so forth, and that was dated May 29, 2007.

And, you know, I'm not sure why you have to meet in executive session to figure out how you're going to put model acts together. So it's still happening, and these things should really be open to

```
1
    the public.
2
            And again, this operation was denounced by
    consumer representatives, not only by Insurance
3
4
    Committee people. So it's still happening, and I
    think there's a lot of work to be done.
5
            I do appreciate your responses today.
6
7
    you.
8
            ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: It would be my
    pleasure to continue working with you,
9
10
    Representative, on them.
11
            REPRESENTATIVE GODSHALL: Thank you,
    Mr. Chairman.
12
            REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: If the members would
13
    -- we have nine members that are on the list to ask
14
    questions. So, Commissioner, if you could condense
15
16
    your answers, and if the members would be mindful of
    our time.
17
18
            Representative Bryan Lentz, please.
19
            REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: Thank you,
20
    Mr. Chairman.
            Good afternoon, Mr. Commissioner.
21
22
            ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Good afternoon.
23
            REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: I was happy to hear
24
    you, in your answers to a couple questions, restate
25
    the commitment of yourself and the Administration to
```

the abatement. I think in speaking to doctors, certainly in my district, that it's an important program and one that we should not lightly dismiss or do away with.

2.0

I think it's one of the things that helps doctors and sort of improves the atmosphere for them here in Pennsylvania, which I think is an atmosphere that can't be underestimated. It's important to have a good atmosphere for medical providers.

Two of the areas that I want to ask you about that I think do not create a good atmosphere for doctors are the low reimbursement rates and the medical liability market, which you mentioned earlier.

Now, I introduced two bills, which Chairman DeLuca was kind enough to have hearings on, one dealing with the reimbursement rate. And we had a surgeon come in and testify, and he brought with him blowups of checks for 1 cent that he received for reimbursement for surgical procedures.

He explained to us in very good detail, with facts that I didn't think really could be challenged, that there are many reimbursement rates for which he actually loses money for getting out of bed at 3 o'clock in the morning and performing a surgery.

So I'm curious, first of all, do you know where we rank nationally for reimbursement rates?

2.0

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative, I assume you're talking about the commercial marketplace here or are you talking about Medicaid reimbursement?

REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: Commercial.

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: The commercial market, to my knowledge, is not ranked, because much of that reimbursement rate is still confidential. I believe it should be more transparent.

I am told that because of the market conditions here, that reimbursement rates -- I probably hear more complaints here than I heard back in Oregon about reimbursement rates. So my general impression is that they are low, but I can't tell you with any precision because they're mostly confidential.

REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: Okay.

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: I do oftentimes get into those discussions. I sometimes hear from insurers saying, such and such a hospital or other provider group is not being reasonable, so I just want you to know that we may discontinue our contracts and you may hear complaints about that, but

here is why we're doing it, because we're trying to control costs.

I say, I absolutely agree with you to negotiate tough contracts and control costs, but be aware that you need to have an adequate network out there, too. So you need to negotiate rates that actually work for people that are fair so that there is a good provider network.

I also hear, less often, because we're not the regulator, but provider groups, our hospitals, come in and say that such and such an insurer is being unfair to us and we may not renew our contract, and so the customers may complain. And I say the same thing, you know, that I expect the insurers to negotiate tough but I expect them to negotiate fair, and I hope you guys work it out.

Ninety-nine percent of time, those arrangements are worked out, and I think that's the way it should be. I think the private sector for the commercial marketplace has to set the rates. I think that the State can be in there trying to figure out what is a fair rate when a very complicated marketplace, like the health marketplace, is not workable.

But I do think there has to be sideboards,

and so we've had actions with different insurers around things like our most-favored-nation clauses and other kinds of unfair practices that sometimes larger carriers in the market try to use to take advantage of their market position, and we always seek out that kind of information. I penned a letter this morning back on a concern in Philadelphia in this respect.

So it ought to be a market-based transaction, but there also ought to be some sideboards and some basic questions of fairness on it, and we do work aggressively on those sorts of situations.

REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ: And just very quickly if you could tell us, how are we doing on lowering the liability rates?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Again,
Representative, thank you for that question.

We're doing very well. Three or four years ago, the major carriers were seeking rate increases in the 30- and 40-percent range. This year the two largest carriers had 6- and 12-percent rate reductions respectively.

The claims in the Mcare Fund, which is a good bellwether measurement of where the rest of the

```
1
    market is, have been cut in half in the last 5 years.
2
    So we are in a much, much better market today than we
3
    were only 5 years ago.
            REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ:
                                    Okay. Thank you.
 4
 5
            ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO:
                                        Thank you.
            REPRESENTATIVE LENTZ:
6
                                    Thank you,
7
    Mr. Chairman.
8
            REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Thank you.
9
            Representative David Reed, please.
10
            REPRESENTATIVE REED: Thank you,
11
    Mr. Chairman.
12
            I thank you, Commissioner, for appearing
13
    before the committee today.
14
            ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Thank you.
            REPRESENTATIVE REED: I have a number of
15
16
    questions, but a number of them are just very basic
17
    questions with a numerical response.
18
            My first question is that in August of 2007,
19
    the Governor announced he was offering adultBasic
20
    coverage to 35,000 individuals across the
21
    Commonwealth who were currently, at that time, on the
22
    waiting list.
23
            How many of those folks actually signed up
24
    for adultBasic coverage?
25
            ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: It's about a
```

third, I believe.

2.0

George, do you have a more precise number?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER HOOVER: About a third is usually good based upon the length of time those folks are on the wait list.

REPRESENTATIVE REED: Okay

Do you have any idea why only a third who were offered -- they had taken the time to sign up for the waiting list, but only a third actually signed up when they were offered entrance into the program?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Very good question.

The main reason, I think, is the timeline.

We have a waiting list that stretches back over a year. So that typically when we're making an offer, like this last offer, the people we are offering it to are people that have been on the waiting list for anywhere from 10 months to 15 or 16 months.

So for a lot of those people, life circumstances have changed. They moved on.

Hopefully a lot of them have gotten a job and gotten insurance that way. Maybe they bought individual insurance. Maybe a spouse has gotten a job. Maybe they have even moved out of the State.

Obviously when people take the time and effort to sign up, at the moment they sign up, presumably they're prepared to take the coverage. So something has changed in their circumstances, and that's a big reason why we would like to see a program that eliminated those wait lists, so that when people came forward to get insurance, that would be available to them that day. And certainly an early target in the CAP program will be the people who are currently on that adultBasic waiting list.

REPRESENTATIVE REED: What happened -- that leaves about 25,000 slots that were offered but not taken up. What happened to those 25,000 slots at that time?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: When we make an offer, we do project what we think the take-up rate will be. So we projected that not everybody would take up the offer.

If literally every person when we made an offer took it up, it would put a great strain on the budget. We keep some money in surplus. We don't make an offer that we intend to spend out every dime we have in case there is a higher take-up rate. But the planning around those things is for a take-up rate less than 100 percent.

1 REPRESENTATIVE REED: So that would be why 2 you don't offer adultBasic signups on a rolling basis? For instance, if you offer 35,000 and 25,000 3 turn you down, those slots aren't automatically given 4 to the next 25,000 folks on the waiting list. 5 are making those offers assuming only a third are 6 7 going to actually sign up for the program. 8 ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: That's correct. REPRESENTATIVE REED: What is the current 9 10 waiting list for the adultBasic program? 11 ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: About 80,000, 12 George? 13 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER HOOVER: About 80. 14 REPRESENTATIVE REED: So we're probably talking about 25,000 to 30,000 folks whom you 15 16 actually anticipate out of that 80,000 when offered 17 will sign up for the program? 18 ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Well, 19 Representative, no, I think a little more, because if 20 we only make an offer to half of them, then we make it to the first half in. So we're dealing only with 21 22 people who have been on the waiting list for some 23 period of time. If we made an offer to the whole waiting 24 25 list, there would be a lot more people that had just

recently been added to the list, and the take-up rate would be higher.

2.0

REPRESENTATIVE REED: Okay. But in the end, when you look at that 80,000 figure, it's a high number. There aren't that many folks out there who have signed up for the waiting list, at least through your historical models, who are actually still waiting for health-care insurance coverage?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Again, it all depends on how far back on the list you go.

George, you might have an answer. If we made an offer to the whole 80,000, we think the take-up rate would be what, half?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER HOOVER: Well, yeah, I would say at least half of those individuals.

Certainly the people that applied most recently would take us up on the offer because they had recently applied for health care. But the ones that were further back, the percentage is less.

REPRESENTATIVE REED: Okay.

My question now is going and transitioning into the Cover All Pennsylvanians program. The Governor's Office has put out the number 767,000 individuals without health-care coverage in the State of Pennsylvania.

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: That is correct.

REPRESENTATIVE REED: Now, we've got a CHIP program that covers all children, and then once you reach a certain age, you're into the Medicare bracket.

There are over 700,000 folks who are supposedly uninsured, but only 80,000 of those folks have taken the time to actually sign up to possibly at some point in the future acquire the adultBasic program. There seems to be a pretty large gap there in between what the Governor is saying and the practices of the actual individuals who are supposedly uninsured.

How do you explain that difference?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Well,

Representative, I think the major explanation point is that the adultBasic program is only available to people below 200 percent of the poverty level. So we're dealing with the poorest citizens of the State who are the only ones eligible, and a significant percentage of the uninsured are above that level; therefore, ineligible for that particular program.

REPRESENTATIVE REED: Do you have estimates on how many of that 767,000 folks would be eligible for the adultBasic program?

1 ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: This is why I'm 2 glad I have George with me. Do you know that number, 3 George? DEPUTY COMMISSIONER HOOVER: Do you mean the 4 number below 200 percent of poverty? 5 REPRESENTATIVE REED: Yes. 6 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER HOOVER: I've got it 7 here somewhere. 8 9 ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: My memory tells 10 me that it's a couple hundred thousand. So something like half the people who are eligible would be on the 11 12 waiting list actually, but we'll try to get it for 13 you. REPRESENTATIVE REED: And while he looks 14 that up, just another follow-up. 15 16 Of that 767,000, let's just assume -- let's 17 say there's 100,000 or 200,000 who meet the 18 adultBasic quidelines. Are those folks accounted 19 for? You know, within that 80,000, you're talking about probably 50 percent no longer need health-care 20 21 coverage who are on that waiting list, 50 percent 22 give or take. Are you accounting for those folks who 23 probably no longer need coverage, or are they still 24 included in that 767,000 folks? 25 ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative,

when we do the surveys -- and by the way, we are doing another survey right now, so there will be an update to the 767,000 -- it counts everybody that's uninsured at that point.

But your questions are very, very good, and I think they go to this point about the Governor's plan: If you look at how many people are currently projected to get coverage under the Governor's CAP plan, over the first 5 years, it's 271,000.

So he's very much in accord with what you're suggesting here, which is if we tried to cover every last one of those 767,000 some of them have moved on, some of them may not even want coverage, so the number that we're actually ending up covering is about a third -- 271,000 of the 767,000.

REPRESENTATIVE REED: For the adultBasic program, folks are also offered, if they don't meet the guidelines for the free coverage, to buy into the program. What are the income eligibility guidelines to buy into that program?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER HOOVER: They're actually the same guidelines. It's just that there's no slot available for that person at that point, so it is still 200 percent.

REPRESENTATIVE REED: Okay.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER HOOVER: So in relation to your question, Representative Reed, also about the number of people under 200 percent of poverty, that's about 453,000 of the uninsured individuals.

REPRESENTATIVE REED: So only 80,000 have taken the time to sign up for the adultBasic program, even though 453,000 are eligible to do so.

Do we have any idea why they would choose not to at least begin the process toward health-care insurance in Pennsylvania?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER HOOVER: Well, number one, they know that there's a very exhaustive wait list and that they may have to wait a year and a half before coverage would be available.

REPRESENTATIVE REED: Okay.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER HOOVER: That's the primary reason that's given to us.

REPRESENTATIVE REED: And just a final question.

From what I understand, the Cover All

Pennsylvanians program is not an entitlement program,

and if sufficient funding is not there in year one to

actually cover all the folks who signed up, there

will be a waiting list as well. Do you anticipate a

similar trend occurring, that folks will fail to sign

up for the Cover All Pennsylvanians program if there's a waiting list?

2.0

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: The idea that we would use a waiting list there is very much open to discussion. There are a number of different ways, if we didn't have the resource.

I mean, so the first issue is, do we have the resource? I believe we will have the resource under the plan and there wouldn't be the problem.

But were there the problem, rather than having a waiting list, there could be a change in eligibility as to who is eligible. There could be a change in the benefit plan to make it go further and cover more people.

So the waiting list plan for the reasons you suggest, putting people on long waiting lists, we do know now, does deter people from even applying for the plan. So per your question, it may not be the most advisable way to deal with a shortfall of money.

But I want to underscore what you said. The program is not an entitlement program; it is a program that we would adjust in some form or fashion if there weren't full funding for it.

REPRESENTATIVE REED: Okay. Just one last follow-up.

When you talk about changing the eligibility for the program, the program is called Cover All Pennsylvanians. If you have eligibility guidelines, then in essence it's not actually Cover All Pennsylvanians; it's Cover All Pennsylvanians that fit the guidelines prescribed by the Governor.

So I think that's an important term differential that we find is playing out at the national level right now with the Presidential campaign, and we hear it in the rhetoric politically oftentimes.

But this program does not actually cover all Pennsylvanians. It assumes certain assumptions about who will sign up and who will not sign up with the possibility of implementing eligibility guidelines at some point in the future that would actually narrow that focus as well.

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative, I think the point about Cover All Pennsylvanians and language about universal coverage and so forth is aspirational to what we're trying to achieve.

But if your point is that the plan in front of you and probably, frankly, any plan will not get us to full universal coverage, you're absolutely right. I think at the State level that's probably

1 not fully achievable. 2 REPRESENTATIVE REED: Okay. Thank you very 3 much. I appreciate it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 4 5 REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Thank you. Representative Kathy Manderino, please. 6 7 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Insurance Commissioner. 8 9 I'm so glad Representative Reed wants to Cover All Pennsylvanians, because I do have a 10 11 universal health-care bill. It's House Bill 1660. 12 only have one Republican cosponsor so far, but I 13 invite your cosponsorship. Thank you very much for being here. 14 Most of my questions about adultBasic have 15 16 been answered, but the one thing that I just want to explore a little bit further, picking up on where 17 18 Representative Reed left off, is let's assume that we 19 get Cover All Pennsylvanians as outlined in Governor 20 Rendell's latest proposal with the Mcare reserve fund 21 surplus money going into the pot along with the extra 22 tobacco tax that he wants to put in there. 23 Is the estimate -- and again, understanding 24 that it's not an entitlement -- but is the estimate 25 that that larger pot will be able to cover everyone

who is waiting? everyone who is waiting under a certain income level?

Can you give us a little bit more detail about what's anticipated that we will be able to cover in addition to where we are now?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: The answer is yes, Representative.

The goal, the 271,000 that would be covered in the projections under the program in the first 5 years, we believe is consistent with what the take-up rate would be in the way that the program is rolled out and offered.

This does depend on a lot of assumptions that actuaries work with. So you have assumptions in there, but the assumptions are not that this would cause a waiting list or that we'd have to reduce the program to cover that number of people.

With the funding the way the Governor proposes it, that's the number of people that would take up the offer, and we would add -- remember, we only have 50,000 today in the adultBasic program, so were we to get to 271,000, that would be more than a fivefold increase in the program over the next 5 years.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Great.

And I have a couple questions about CHIP, but let me just kind of ask one other about adultBasic that rolls in.

When we did the Cover All Children, one of the things which I actually kind of want to update a report on is we allowed families over and above, I think it's 300-percent poverty for children, but we allowed families over that to buy in at cost.

Is that envisioned for adultBasic? If you're bare, if, you know, you meet all those other requirements -- you don't have insurance through an employment or other source and you've been bare for so long -- do we envision Cover All Pennsylvanians allowing people who can't get access to the health insurance market other ways to buy into adultBasic at cost?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Great.

Let me take that right to CHIP. Tell me about where we are with Cover All Children in terms of what's happening with enrollment, what's happening with the buy-ins for CHIP Plus, and particularly what's happening with what I'll call the full-cost buy-ins?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: I'm going to give

that one to George.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER HOOVER: Sure, and thank you for your support with the Cover All Kids expansion to CHIP. It has enabled us to offer health care to all children that meet the eligibility requirements.

Enrollment has continued to grow almost every month since we have implemented Cover All Kids, and we're up to now about 168,000 kids enrolled in the program. Over the course of the Governor's Administration, enrollment has grown about 35 percent over where it was when he took office.

And we actually do have about a thousand children that have their family, as of the current data as of this month, that are actually buying in at cost. So there are about a thousand kids that obviously wouldn't have had health care that are above 300 percent.

Plus, we've got a number of other children, probably in the neighborhood of 5,000, that are in the expanded eligibility group.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Okay.

Can you tell me, one of the things that my recollection is that we did in order to protect against concerns that people might have had about

folks dropping coverage and going into CHIP, we have put a kind of go-bare for any children over 2 years of age in the program requirements. Are you able to track or tell kind of what impact that has had? Is that something that is a barrier? Is that something that's kind of a good policy decision?

I'm just trying to get a feeling of whether we know yet, based on whatever track record we have, about a year now, whether that was a good or a bad policy decision, from both sides, from the family insurance side and from -- from the child being insured versus the insurance side.

I just want to understand the impact of that.

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative, it's a very good question, and I appreciate your asking that from both sides, because you will hear from the advocates that when you put in a go-bare period like that, it's a deterrent for some people. And even if it's not a deterrent, it does keep them out of coverage for some period of time, and some bad things can happen in that time. So it's not the ideal thing to do.

But on the other side of the equation, we do know that it works. It does avoid the crowd-out

problem. We believe there hasn't been a crowd-out problem in the CHIP program in this State, and we believe that the period of uninsurance, the 6 months of uninsurance, is the principal reason, and that's consistent with data around the country.

2.0

There frankly are very few people out there who currently have insurance who want to game the system so badly that they want to give up their own insurance and go bare for some period of time, 6 months or more, and then come in and try to get in a different State program.

So it's not the ideal, but it's probably a necessary part of a program like this to avoid the crowd-out problem that you reference.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Great.

My last question goes again to the Mcare abatement. And in response to Representative Lentz, you said, you know, we're in a much better insurance marketplace than we have been in the past, but that was a very subjective, I guess, analysis.

What I'm looking for is, my recollection, again under the Mcare Act, the department must certify by some stated date every year what the status of the insurance market is in order to decide whether or not the Mcare abatement is still

necessary. What is that date certain for this year?

Has it come or has it not come?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative, your recollection is generally correct. It's not quite every year, though. The program envisioned decisions every couple years depending on how first decisions went and so forth.

So there was a decision point last year, in 2007, on whether to take the market up, and it didn't deal directly with the abatements. It dealt with, today, the market is half a million, you pay it for yourself through the marketplace; the next half million is the Mcare layer.

So the decision point in 2007 was, should that 500 number be taken up to 750, so that three-quarters of the coverage would be in the private sector, one-quarter from Mcare?

The decision was not to do that. Again, I wasn't directly involved in that. It was right at the time that I was coming in, but I've looked at it now and learned it, because I know I'm going to have to make the decision in the future, and I think the principal reason it wasn't done was because in the prior markets, most of the market was insurance companies. Those are the kinds of animals that we

know well, we know what kind of capitalization they have, and they follow all the rules. Today, more than a quarter of the market is risk-retention groups. Those are entities that are subject to less regulation. They kind of come into the market when there are problems with getting insurance companies to come into the market. So there was a nervousness about whether those risk-retention groups were here to stay, were they financially solid, and so forth. And so that's the part that continues to be looked at.

The next decision point, based on the fact that we didn't step up, as they say, in 2007, is in June of 2009, and that would be another decision about whether to go from 500 to 750. So that's still more than a year away.

Again, I want to underscore, there are discussions in this building, and I think they're good discussions, about making those decisions on a more graduated basis so that you can slowly ramp up there and have less disruption, and it makes it easier to deal with uncertainties like risk-retention group if you're only taking that baby step instead of this leap to 750.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Okay. Thank you.

```
1
            Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
2
            REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Thank you.
            Just for the members' information, the
 3
4
    Pennsylvania State Police are scheduled to be here at
           So I thought the longer you make them wait,
5
    those of us that drive the turnpike, that would be a
6
7
    good piece of information to have.
8
            Next, Representative Gordon Denlinger.
            REPRESENTATIVE DENLINGER:
9
                                        Mr. Chairman, you
10
    know how to put fear into people right there.
11
            ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO:
                                        It was those auto
12
    CAT surcharge funds, right?
13
            REPRESENTATIVE DENLINGER: There it is.
            Good afternoon.
14
15
            ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Good afternoon.
16
            REPRESENTATIVE DENLINGER: A couple of
17
    questions about community health reinvestment, and
18
    then I want to go into some items about CHIP.
19
            But the portion of CHR dollars that flow
20
    toward adultBasic is about 60 percent. In this
21
    budget that you submitted, you are estimating that
22
    this allocation will rise from approximately
23
    $90 million in '07-08 to over $121 million in '08-09.
    What is the reason for the increase?
24
25
            ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative,
```

good question, because I looked at the numbers and asked the same thing, and the answer is that it's related to changing from a fiscal year to a calendar year or vice-versa, based on some sort of carryover money that gives us a particularly large share next year.

If you look out into the out-years, you go back into the \$80 million range, and then it starts ramping up at a more gradual basis based on premium growth.

So the CHR, this year is kind of an exception, aberration year at \$120 million. The funding there really is kind of a baseline of about \$80 million, and then the budget numbers project that we're going to continue to have an expanding health-care market. Premiums are going to go up, therefore CHR contributions go up on a, I think a 2-or 4-percent per year basis.

REPRESENTATIVE DENLINGER: So there was nothing in that calculation that relates back to the proposed Highmark-IBC consolidation?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Yes, there is nothing in there that relates to that in any form or fashion.

REPRESENTATIVE DENLINGER: Okay.

On that consolidation, Highmark and IBC, if that moves forward, assuming that it does, what requirements do you expect to place on the new entity as far as CHR?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative, I have no thoughts on that at this point. The first decision point on that consolidation is that the Legislature, going back to what Representative Godshall gave me, has set seven basic criteria that have to be met for that consolidation to be approved.

Our focus today is on whether those seven conditions are met. We'll do an analysis. We'll do a set of public hearings. We'll make that decision.

If that decision is no, then any discussion about anything else is irrelevant. If that decision is yes, then I've heard talk that people may say, well, there maybe ought to be some conditions. So that could be a subject of discussion at that point.

But for right now, the issue is, is that consolidation good for Pennsylvania or not? And I know there's a lot of discussion about spending money that may or may not come, but I would submit to you, the health marketplace in Pennsylvania is about a trillion-dollar market over the next 10 years -- a trillion-dollar market. That decision ought to be

made on what's good for that trillion-dollar market and not on, you know, \$20 million or \$80 million or even a billion dollars here and there. Those are small amounts of money that shouldn't interfere with the right decision in that case.

REPRESENTATIVE DENLINGER: So we're a little early in the process; we're not ready for requirements at this point?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: No. We have said, Representative, that if we get full cooperation from Highmark and IBC, we believe we can hold public hearings sometime this summer. Probably July is what we're looking at optimistically right now.

And if we hold to that timetable and, again, we get full cooperation after the hearing, we could have a decision by the end of the year.

REPRESENTATIVE DENLINGER: Moving over to the CHIP program, I guess at the Federal level where we stand at this point is that SCHIP has expired and we're operating under a continuing resolution that funds States that are in danger of having their CHIP program shut down. Is that correct?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative, that's correct.

Pennsylvania is in a little better shape

than most States in terms of how long we can go with the continuing resolutions and so forth. But you're essentially right; we're living on borrowed time on that program.

REPRESENTATIVE DENLINGER: And I have understood that we in fact have generally had a lot of money in this area. In fact, we have significant reserves. Based on our level of reserves, how long can we run without reauthorization?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: George is better, if you could answer that.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER HOOVER: Sure.

Number one, if we didn't have money, we would be able to get money the same as other States who have completely run out of money. But with the money that we have right now, we're good through January of 2009.

But we would also qualify -- we have \$151 million in reserves as of the beginning of next fiscal year. So as of July 1, 2008, we'll already have \$151 million in reserves. So we would be able to carry that money forward. When we ran out of money, we would then qualify for our allocation.

Many States that have run out of money and didn't have the reserves like we do are using their

```
1
    allocation. So you only get your allocation for next
2
    year when you have run out of any carryover funds.
            REPRESENTATIVE DENLINGER: All right.
 3
            ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative,
 4
5
    the way I translate that, too, is remember, there's
6
    an election here in November and there will be a new
    Administration in. So long before we would run out
7
8
    of money, that new Administration, whatever it
9
    happens to be and whatever position it takes, it will
10
    have control over these decisions more than the
11
    current regime.
12
            REPRESENTATIVE DENLINGER: So for good or
13
    for ill, hopefully the election will fix that issue.
            ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO:
14
                                        Yes.
            REPRESENTATIVE DENLINGER: Good.
15
16
            DEPUTY COMMISSIONER HOOVER: There's
17
    actually $168 million there waiting for us.
18
    what our allocation is for the year. So we don't
19
    need to tap into that until we would run through the
2.0
    $151 million.
21
            REPRESENTATIVE DENLINGER: Well, in light of
22
    that discussion, let's go through a little scenario
23
    here.
24
            If we're put into a position where we have
25
    to spend down our entire reserve and that ship is
```

reauthorized either at level funding or perhaps even a decrease in funding and we don't have the money to pay for the expanded CHIP program, the population expansion that we've had, what exactly will you do? How will you handle that?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative, this is one of them, I'm happy to say, that will fall back into your lap, because it would be an appropriation issue. If there was a shortage of Federal money for that program, some hard decisions would have to be made as to whether we want to put more State resource into that or change the program in some form or fashion.

I would say that I don't think that that's the likely scenario with that program. That program tends to be quite popular on both sides of the aisle, and so I anticipate that that program will continue to be federally supported.

But if it's not, like any other kind of federally supported program, the State would have to make some hard decisions about how to respond in those circumstances.

REPRESENTATIVE DENLINGER: Well, would you take the step of seeking Federal approval to switch funding over to medical assistance?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: I believe that question is premature, and I believe it also -- well, I know it wouldn't be a question that I as Insurance Commissioner would have the principal role in. That would be a decision for the Governor, and I think maybe he would listen more to his Secretary of Public Welfare rather than his Insurance Commissioner on that.

2.0

REPRESENTATIVE DENLINGER: And then one final item, and I'll keep moving here, Mr. Chairman.

CMS, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid

Services, sent a "Dear State Health Officials" letter

out last August regarding SCHIP, and the letter

basically says that any State CHIP program, that in

order for it to be expanded above the 250-percent

poverty level, that we have to be providing insurance

to a population of 95 percent of those in the State

who qualify for CHIP and who are at 200 percent or

below the Federal poverty level.

As I understand the numbers given earlier, I think we would be in technical violation of that letter. Am I correct in my understanding there?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative, we believe we're very close at meeting that particular standard.

And again I would point out that there are a number of other standards in that bill, and we're actually one of the leading States in the country in terms of meeting with CMS and discussing these issues to come closer to meeting most of those standards.

2.0

But I will also note to you that there is litigation over that from other States. We have not been a party. Again, we tend to be a pretty shining example of a State that has a pretty stellar program here. And we are trying to work with CMS on this, but some of their conditions, like extending the uninsurance period from 6 months to a year and some of the other conditions, we're not particularly enamored with.

And how exactly this all works out in an environment in which, again, there will be different people making decisions at CMS shortly, those questions involve some fairly complicated back-and-forth discussions.

REPRESENTATIVE DENLINGER: Very good.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Thank you.

Representative Cherelle Parker.

REPRESENTATIVE PARKER: Thank you,

25 Mr. Chair, and I'll definitely be brief. I only have

two very short questions.

2.0

Gentlemen, if you could just briefly, for my benefit and the benefit of those who are watching, because sometimes when we are talking about policy and we spew numbers, things get a tad bit confusing for those who are watching.

So I just want to make sure I'm correct in recapping that you noted that here in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, with a population of approximately 12 million people, we have approximately 800,000, almost a million adults who live in our Commonwealth who are uninsured.

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative, that's correct.

REPRESENTATIVE PARKER: But you also noted that probably only a third of those who apply to enroll in our adultBasic actually have gained service based on the eligibility requirements along with the long waiting lists. I just want to make sure I'm clear.

There was a waiting list to eligible requirements, and that many times when we are in a position to offer them a spot in the program, many of their circumstances have changed. I just want to make sure I'm clear, because the one thing I didn't

hear you say, because it sounds very confusing to the public when we give a number of almost a million adults who are uninsured, and we have a program and only a third of them are being served.

What we didn't talk about was the number of those people without insurance who use our emergency rooms as preventive care when they are in crisis mode, and in the end, the State has to pay for those services on the back end. So if they were enrolled in the program, we could be focusing on preventive versus crisis care, and I just wanted to get your professional opinion on that.

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative, thank you very much for that question.

We have so far talked about the uninsured problem in terms of access for those people, and that's very important both as a policy matter and as a moral matter, frankly, to address.

But it can also be looked at as a cost issue in the system, because the reality is, as you suggest, when people don't have insurance in this society, they do not go without any help forever; they show up in emergency rooms. And as a good society and also with a push from the Federal government saying that hospitals have to do it, they

have to see people in the emergency room, and that is a cost that's in the system.

2.0

there is much more expensive. It's estimated that
the cost of the uninsured is something like a
6-percent drag on everybody else's premiums.
Hospitals don't get paid there. They put that cost
into the commercial ratepayers' rates, and we all pay
more for it.

And guess what? As you point out, the care

So we want to fully get a handle on these issues from a cost perspective, and that's critical. If we don't control the costs of health care, these other things that we do aren't going to matter in the long run.

And part of controlling costs is getting the uninsured into care where they can get the same kind of preventive care -- chronic-care management, disease management -- that is used in the parts of the market, particularly large group market, where we're most effective at controlling costs.

So a very important point. Thank you for that question.

REPRESENTATIVE PARKER: Thank you.

Finally -- just the last question, Mr.

25 | Chairman -- I want to just go back to some comments

that Chairmen DeLuca and Micozzie mentioned as it relates to small businesses and this actual population, and we want you to really describe them for those who are watching. Because when we talk about covering the uninsured and we talk about those small businesses, who I believe are the lifeline of the economic stability of our Commonwealth and even much of our country, although some of them do provide health care, those who can find a way to afford it, you know, with the revenue that they generate, there are a lot who really would like to provide insurance and cover their workers. And these are workers who are working full time and not individuals who are sitting home twiddling their thumbs asking for the State to give them a hand out, but that they are really seeking self-sufficiency.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Could you just tell us a little bit again about that demographic of people who, they work full time but they are still in need of health-care insurance?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Most of the uninsured work full time. That's a very important point and oftentimes an overlooked one in the market.

I traveled from Philadelphia out to

Pittsburgh and many stops in between listening to

small business owners describe their health-care issues, and they wrestle with it. There are very, very few small business owners who don't want to provide health care. When they don't provide it, it's because they can't manage it.

And several, you know, we were told very hard luck stories about how they did provide it, and then they saw rate increases or they had a workforce that wasn't on the healthy end of the spectrum and so they couldn't afford it anymore.

Again, those groups are very, very vulnerable in today's marketplace with no rating restrictions to large, unaffordable rates if they have anybody in the group who is sick. And as a society, presumably the people who are sick are the people who most need the care, whom we ought to be most concerned with.

But as one of my colleagues likes to say, there's a lot of competition in this State in the health-care business for the healthiest risks.

Everybody wants, all the insurers want to get the healthiest risks because they make money on those, but they don't want to have a big pool, let's say, with the unhealthy.

So we heard from a lot of those people, and

```
1
    there are people in real need out there, people
2
    losing their insurance every day. As a State, we
 3
    have gone from 68 percent of employer-based coverage
    to 60-percent employer-based coverage. That's one of
4
 5
    the steepest drops in the country in the last
    6 years.
6
7
            So it's a very real and very difficult
    problem out there, and I hope we can work with you
8
    and the rest of the General Assembly to solve it.
9
10
            REPRESENTATIVE PARKER:
                                    Thank you.
11
            Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
12
            REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Thank you.
13
            Representative Scott Petri, please.
14
            REPRESENTATIVE PETRI:
                                    Thank you,
    Mr. Chairman.
15
16
            Thank you, Commissioner.
17
            ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO:
                                        Thank you.
18
            REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: During the summer, on
19
    a bipartisan basis, the Bucks County delegation held
20
    a hearing with a number of insurance health-related
21
    people, and I thought it was pretty informative.
22
            One of the many issues or concerns that came
23
    up actually came up with the proposed reimbursement,
24
    and using the Mercer actuarial study, it was
25
    projected that the reimbursement rate would be equal
```

to MA plus 5 percent.

And the doctors, in particular, that testified indicated to us that based upon their current practices, they could not even afford to pay their nurses under that reimbursement rate.

I can't imagine Bucks County is singular in that. Has your Department heard concerns about the proposed reimbursement rates under Cover All Pennsylvanians?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative, absolutely we have.

This may be a better question to take up in more detail at the next hearing, or I guess two up the road. There's a State Police hearing and then there's a 3 o'clock hearing where Rosemarie Greco will be here from the Office of Health Care Reform, and they've wrestled with these questions.

Somebody asked, what happens if you don't have enough money in the program to cover everybody? And there are a lot of different give points in the program. One of them always is, well, how much are we going to reimburse the providers in this program? And that issue gets debated, as you know, in this building quite a bit.

Most of the current models that are out

there envision a higher level of reimbursement than the Medicaid plus 5 that you referenced. At those numbers, the doctors have made their point that those reimbursement levels are pretty, pretty tough for them, and so again, most of the proposals here are going to have a higher level of reimbursement.

But as we get into the number crunch on this, trying to get a program done, that's one of the tough tradeoffs, is how much do we pay the providers? What does that mean in terms of how many people we can cover? What does that mean in terms of what the benefit package is going to be? So it's a very important point.

REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: Well, I want to take it the next step.

As a regulator, I'm curious as to your reaction, because since the delay in the Mcare situation to March 31, many of the physicians have come to me with, I would call them fears about what they may be required to do in order to continue to receive the abatement.

Is there going to be and as a regulator do you think it's appropriate that there be some sort of tie or agreement that says, well, if you want to continue to receive your abatement, you will

subscribe?

That's a real fear doctors have expressed to me.

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative, you're asking some very tough questions here, but if you say to me, if the Commonwealth is going to spend precious dollars on an abatement program -- and we have spent a lot of money on it -- is it appropriate to think about obligations in return for that? I thing it's appropriate to think about it.

Are there particular ones that have to be part of a program? No, but I know there are proposals in this building to look at, you know, certain obligations in relation to that. And I'm not making friends with my medical provider community here, but I don't think that's an inappropriate category.

I think all of us ought to think both in terms of what we can get from the government and what we can do to help the Commonwealth with its problems at the same time.

REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: Well, I do think it is an appropriate debate. However, understand that doctors are looking at it like on the one hand, I can't continue to stay without the abatement, so if

you don't give me the abatement, you don't want me.

And if you make me subscribe to this program where
the reimbursement rate is below my actual costs, I
also can't stay. So in either event, in my opinion,
it's an insult to the subscriber, because they will
not have a doctor to treat them, so you have a
program that doesn't really work.

I want to switch topics a minute, and I want to talk a little bit about the Governor's proposal to provide a flood tax on policies. I've heard some rumors that it would only be on flood insurance policies, and then I also heard that it would be on all property policies, and I was wondering if you had any of the details on that.

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative, yes, I do.

We started with the notion that it would, if possible, it would make some sense to target that on the structures, and it's not just homeowners but also commercial structures in the floodplains that were going to directly benefit. But when we looked at how to do that, there wasn't an administratively feasible way to do it.

So then we thought about, well, if we go all the way to the other extreme and have it be a

tax-supported program, that would spread the cost among everybody in the Commonwealth.

And in the end, we came back in the middle between the two and have a program that is now based on a small, a very small 7 cents per \$100 of property coverage on all property insurance coverages in the State.

So that sweeps in all the homeowner policies, which is about half of it, and all the commercial insurance property-based coverages, which is the other half.

And for a homeowner, doing the math on 7 cents per \$100, the average homeowner policy is about 600 bucks, and so you're talking about 42 cents on a typical homeowner policy.

REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: Now, last question.

What do you project raising from that tax and what do you intend to do with it? Because that's the real issue.

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative, that will raise \$3.3 million per year, and that money combined with some Federal money supports a bonding program.

And the details of that are not something that my department handles. Those are good questions

```
for the Department of Environmental Protection.
2
    the revenue stream is $3.3 million per year from the
    assessment that we talked about.
3
            REPRESENTATIVE PETRI:
                                    Thank you,
    Mr. Chairman.
            REPRESENTATIVE KELLER:
                                     Thank you.
            Representative Scott Conklin.
            REPRESENTATIVE CONKLIN: I know we're
    running late on time, so I'm going to shorten up a
9
    lot of them. I just want to follow up on what
    Cherelle and some other folks were talking about.
11
12
            When you are talking about the folks, when
13
    you are looking at the Governor's proposed budget --
    I believe it's $479 million for Cover All
14
    Pennsylvanians -- when you're talking about that
16
    800,000, are you using the number of the $479 million
    to cover all 800,000 or are you using the figure of
17
    about 270,000 people will actually come in and sign
18
19
    up for the insurance?
            ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative,
21
    I'm not sure if you're using the $479 million and in
22
    what year's spectrum, but we're talking about the
23
    real program here, which would cover, we project,
24
    271,000, up from the 50,000 currently to 271,000 by
    year 5.
```

1

4

5

6

7

8

10

15

2.0

25

```
1
            REPRESENTATIVE CONKLIN: Okay. So the
2
    279 is the figure using the 271 enrollment?
            ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: The 479 -- I'm
 3
4
    looking at some of my numbers here, and I'm not
    seeing the 479 number that you are using, but---
5
            REPRESENTATIVE CONKLIN:
                                      There is
6
7
    $479.5 million in the '08-09 for the projected
8
    proposal that the Governor has to Cover All
    Pennsylvanians.
9
10
            ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Yes,
11
    Representative. I now do see it.
12
            In the first year, that is the total cost.
13
    That includes about $200 million coming from the
    Federal government.
14
15
            That's an important point in the CAP
    program, is unlike CHIP, today adultBasic is all
16
    funded with State money. CHIP is funded about
17
18
    two-thirds with Federal money, and this program in
19
    its first year would have $200 million roughly of
2.0
    Federal funding in that 479.
21
            REPRESENTATIVE CONKLIN:
                                     Okay.
                                             Is that
22
    taking into account the buy-in that folks will have
23
    to pay in, those folks who will have to pay in it
24
    because of their income or because of the
25
    contribution that they'd have to put in?
```

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative,
2 yes, it will.

That's an important point: In the first year, \$77 million of enrollee share contributions, and if you look out to year 5, \$258 million of enrollee participation.

So this program is very much a partnership. The Federal government has a share, the State government has a share, but the phrase I hear a lot these days is "skin in the game." Everybody has to have skin in the game so that they pay attention to health-care costs.

I think it's absolutely correct. Everybody needs to be sensitive to costs in the system, and this program has \$258 million coming from enrollees by year 5.

REPRESENTATIVE CONKLIN: I'm actually going somewhere with this.

Cherelle brought up a point that I think needs to be known, that when you look at Pennsylvania today and you're looking at those folks that have to run a hospital, I know in my little community one of the reasons it closed were the uninsured, that they could not absorb the large number of uninsured people coming into that facility who needed coverage but had

no means to pay for it.

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Statewide, do you have any figure about how much statewide hospitals lose because of treating uninsured individuals?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative, no, I do not, and I wouldn't want to hazard a guess on that, but I'll get you that number.

REPRESENTATIVE CONKLIN: Well, what I'm getting at, as we go down the road, am I correct in presuming that as we go down the road to Cover All Pennsylvanians, in the long run not only will people have better health care, not only will these facilities such as my little rural area that had to close, and one of the reasons was treating uninsured individuals, don't you believe that that figure of just the money that we'll save alone for not having hospitals losing money that will come back into the State will actually be beneficial costwise? the human aspect of it, which is the most important aspect, but for those individuals that believe that the penny is much more important than the pound of flesh, that we can save? Do you believe that that may come as a break-even point in the long run?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative, absolutely.

I mean, if you draw the larger context here, the United States spends 16 percent of GDP on health care. That's twice as much as any other country in the world, and we get less for it in terms of results. So there are tremendous inefficiencies in our current system, and you're putting your finger on some of them.

2.0

If we can get the various parties together into some system that has everybody in and covered and everybody getting the most cost effective sort of treatment, absolutely the hospitals benefit, the providers benefit, the citizens benefit.

It's in all of our interests to get this job done, and there are tremendous efficiencies.

REPRESENTATIVE CONKLIN: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

17 REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Thank you.

The first member to cut into the State Police time, Representative Steve Barrar.

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Can I refuse to answer anymore questions so I don't get involved here?

REPRESENTATIVE BARRAR: I'm going out and buying a radar unit right after this so I have one of those radar detector things.

Good afternoon, Commissioner.

2.0

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Good afternoon.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRAR: Awhile ago I think we had spoken about an issue with the chiropractors and other health-care providers dealing with multiple copays, where they would pay multiple copays for different services performed in an office instead of one copay per office visit.

What is happening with that now? Is there anything going on with that?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative, yes. We're continuing to work on that situation.

Earlier we had a conversation about reimbursements and how reimbursements are basically a market-based transaction. We don't get in the middle of them. But we do get in the middle of unfair practices and set some sideboards on that, and one of those practices is the one that you and I discussed where there are multiple copays.

And we also discussed the situation where somebody is reimbursed and then some period later, a long period later maybe, they are told that that was an improper reimbursement and they need to pay it back.

I think those are issues that are worth

looking at. And on the issue of the timeline in particular, we may want to address that legislatively.

But the copay issue is also one, and I believe the particular situation that we discussed has been resolved. But I can get back to you on the specifics of that.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRAR: Yes. They have forwarded me legislation that I think one of the other States just passed. I can't remember which one. But they're asking me to take a look at that and then something I would run by you.

On another issue, a real quick question, the Underground Storage Tank Fund. There was a controversy earlier this year dealing with a penny increase in the fund. Can you explain to us what happen with that?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Yes. That fund, and this is where insurance regulators, sometimes we are told that we make lousy friends but great ancestors, because we tell people, you know, the party today has consequences tomorrow. But if we do our job right, our ancestors could say, thank God someone is protecting the future, and the future in that case is a \$375 million unfunded liability.

We talked about the Mcare unfunded liability. The tank program has a \$375 million unfunded liability. So that board looked at that and said they would vote -- these are the people that actually pay these fees -- they said, we think we ought to increase the fee to cover that.

When that went to the Legislature -- and I fault myself for not consulting with the Legislature before it came forward -- but when it came forward in the Legislature, they said, this looks an awful lot like a gas tax to us; we don't think it should be done right now with gas at over \$3 a gallon, and as you know, it's only gotten worse since.

So when it was framed that way and the question was, well, do we have to do this today at a period of high gas prices, the answer is no. We can keep the party going today, because the cash flow is there all the way to 2014, so it's not an immediate problem for us. But I do have to be the guy that tells you that if we continue to put it off, at some point there's going to be that \$375 million liability.

Today, that would come due in 2014. So we put the problem off, and that's essentially what happened there.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRAR: So the fund, are you saying that the fund is broke right now, or is there a surplus of money in the fund? Or is that liability, that 300-some-million-dollar liability, existing debt that is bills that need to be paid today?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: It depends on what you mean by broke. It's not broke in a cash-flow way. Again, we have money to continue to handle obligations all the way to 2014.

But from an insurance perspective, it is insolvent in the long run, because if we don't have some change in the program, we will run out of money and we'll have \$375 million in debt that we won't be able to cover on current projections.

So yes, it's broken in the long-run sense and it will have to be addressed.

And by the way, the \$375 million liability assumes that the full \$100,000 million that was borrowed by the Legislature some years ago is paid back. In this budget, there is a \$10 million payment back on that \$100 million, and there have been several payments previously.

If that were not to happen, then there would be even more than a \$375 million liability there.

```
1
            REPRESENTATIVE BARRAR: So the funding
    was -- there was a raid on the fund. And what year
2
    was that? Was that 2003?
3
 4
            ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: I'm not sure, but
5
    it's about -- it's somewhere right around the turn of
    the decade.
6
7
            REPRESENTATIVE BARRAR: Okay. All right.
            ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: I can get that
8
9
    number for you, too.
10
            REPRESENTATIVE BARRAR: Yes.
            ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: We'll get that
11
12
    number, that data for you. I believe it's right
13
    around 2000.
            REPRESENTATIVE BARRAR: And the fund
14
    collects how much per year?
15
16
            ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: It is in the
17
    $80 or $90 million dollar range.
            REPRESENTATIVE BARRAR: And it spends what
18
19
    it takes in, or does it accumulate a pot of money?
20
            ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Last year, I
    believe it took in, you know, slightly under
21
22
    $80 million and spent slightly more, so a couple
23
    million dollar shortfall, something in that range.
24
    I'll get you the exact numbers on that, too.
25
            REPRESENTATIVE BARRAR: Great.
```

1 That's all I have, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. 2 REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Thank you. 3 Representative Dan Frankel. REPRESENTATIVE FRANKEL: 4 Thanks, Mr. Chairman. 5 Commissioner, very nice to meet you. 6 7 ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: You, too. REPRESENTATIVE FRANKEL: Let me just quickly 8 -- and I don't want to spend a lot of time on this, 9 10 but maybe you can put on your prognostication hat with respect, and I want to change the subject, to 11 12 property/casualty insurance. 13 I mean, we're seeing, you know, incredible volatility in the financial markets, the collapse of 14 the credit markets. We've been enjoying -- I mean, 15 at least commercial consumers of insurance have been 16 17 enjoying a pretty soft market, a competitive 18 marketplace for property and casualty coverage. 19 Do you see -- and we had these incredible 20 disappointing earnings from AIG last week, probably 21 the largest, if not one of the largest insurers of 22 commercial property/casualty insurance in the 23 country. Do you have any concerns with respect to 24 the soft market being replaced by a hard market? 25 shrink in the capacity to write commercial property

and casualty insurance and issues with solvency potentially down the road with carriers?

And let me also -- while you are doing that,

I'll put it all on the table at one time -- with

respect to the personal property casualty business,

with the problems in the lending with credit,

homeowners' policies, foreclosures, what are we

seeing in the personal property and casualty

business, both on the homeowners and the automobile

side, on cancellations and on renewals, things like

that?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: An excellent set of questions. You have a good beat on the market the way you framed the questions there.

I would have told you generally, and I still would tell you generally, that I think the property and casualty markets are quite solid and stable today.

In general terms, the market is doing better financially for the last several years and likely into 2008 than it has done since the 1970s, and in some respects since the 1950s. So the financial fundamentals here are very, very solid.

The reason, the only reason I hesitate a little is that I read my Wall Street Journal

yesterday that Warren Buffett, who is somewhat of a better prognosticator than I am -- at least in my view he is -- said that he thought that the property/casualty industry was going to take about a 4-point knockdown this year based on what you referenced around the lending, the credit crisis, and so forth.

And a number of my colleagues, particularly the New York superintendent, Eric Dinallo, and the Wisconsin Commissioner, Sean Dilweg, are wrestling with the bond insurers and trying to manage that market.

So there are some troubling signs out there, and, you know, we've had 3 years of pretty low-level catastrophe exposures by the major carriers. Were there to be a major set of catastrophes this year, we would see a real crisis down there in Florida. That would spill over to other marketplaces.

And so there are warning signs on the horizon, the most important of which is
Warren Buffett's warning about a 4-percent knockdown.
That is something to be concerned with. But in general terms, the markets are pretty solid here.

And my daily inbox has the same kind of set of questions that mostly have been asked here, which

```
1
    are health questions. Everybody is concerned about
2
    the affordability of health care. And I don't,
3
    frankly, have a lot of issues coming into my office
4
    about the property and casualty, particularly the
    personal lines.
5
            Now, having said that, I normally hear from
6
7
    people in Philadelphia about auto insurance and so
8
    forth.
          So it's not perfect, but relatively speaking,
    those markets are pretty stable.
9
10
            REPRESENTATIVE FRANKEL: Thank you.
11
            REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Mr. Commissioner,
12
    the oracle from Omaha is always correct?
13
            ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: I just say he's a
14
    better prognosticator than me. If he were always
    correct, he would be even wealthier than he is.
15
            REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Vice Chairman
16
17
    Representative Craig Dally, please.
18
            REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: Thank you,
    Mr. Chairman.
19
2.0
            Good afternoon, Commissioner.
            ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Good afternoon.
21
22
            REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: Commissioner, I was
23
    happy to hear in your earlier testimony that the
24
    Governor enthusiastically endorses the Mcare
25
    abatement program. But I guess actions speak louder
```

than words.

Back in December when that was due to expire, he decided to hold it hostage for political reasons. We, myself and Representative Reichley and the entire Lehigh Valley delegation, sponsored a resolution requesting that he extend the Mcare payment for 90 days pending, you know, resolution of the outstanding issues. So that resolution wasn't considered, but in essence the Governor then did in fact do that.

Do you think it's right for the Governor to hold our doctors hostage to his other political agenda items?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative, I don't think we should hold anybody hostage, and I don't think that that's what is going on. But I do think that it's acceptable and certainly normal practice for folks involved in the political process to say, here's a program over here that I have concerns with, here's another one over here, and I think there's a natural connection between these two programs and they ought to be taken up together.

I think that's a fair characterization of what the Governor is doing. He's seeing a link between these programs. And to me, there's a clear

link. I think the reason we provide an abatement to doctors is not simply because we think doctors need an abatement but because we think it connects directly to having an effective health-care system in the State. And I think it's right, and that's why the Governor supports it, that is why I support it, and I assume that is why you support it.

And I think dealing with the uninsured problem also has a very direct connection to the effective health-care marketplace here. So to my mind, I wouldn't call it hostage taking; I would call it comprehensive legislation that tries to deal with a set of problems in a coherent way.

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: I wouldn't expect you to use the same terminology I did.

But at present, how much money is in the Health Care Provider Retention Account? Do you know?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative, I get this confused as to which money is over here and which money has been transferred to Mcare, but in total---

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: I don't think it really matters to this Governor. It's one big pot, and it doesn't really matter where it comes from.

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: It is one big

```
1
    pot, though, that is correct, but it's about a half a
2
    billion dollars of money there that can be used in
    some combination for addressing the phase down, phase
3
4
    out of the Mcare Fund and also to deal with the
    uninsured problem.
5
            REPRESENTATIVE DALLY:
6
7
            ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Again, it's
    because of the success we've had in that market that
8
    we have that.
9
10
            REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: And my final
    question: The portion of the community health
11
    reinvestment dollars that go toward the adultBasic
12
13
    program is 60 percent. In this budget, you're
    estimating that this allocation will rise from
14
    approximately $90 million in 2007-2008 to over
15
    $121 million in 2008-2009.
16
17
            Oh, I'm sorry; has this question been asked?
18
            REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Yes, when you were
19
    out of the room.
            ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: As the lawyers
2.0
21
    would say, asked and answered earlier.
22
            REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: Okay. I apologize.
23
            ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: But it's an
24
    anomaly. The short answer is, it's an anomaly for
25
    this year. That funding stream is around $80 million
```

```
1
    a year and then will grow over time. If you look at
2
    the out-years, it goes back into that $80 to
3
    $90 million range.
 4
            REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: Okay. I apologize
    for that.
5
            Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
6
7
            REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Thank you.
            Representative Doug Reichley, please.
8
9
            REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Thank you,
10
    Mr. Chairman.
11
            Mr. Commissioner, we'll try to wrap this up,
12
    because I know we're all trying to get to the next
13
    couple of hearings.
            Just to follow up on some earlier answers
14
15
    you gave. Your answers to Representative Dally and I
16
    think Representative Micozzie raised some questions
    that I have.
17
18
            Is it your position that unless the doctors
19
    agree to take the reduced compensation rate under
20
    CAP, they should not receive the abatement?
21
            ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative,
22
    no, that's not my position.
23
            I think the question was framed much more
24
    broadly than that and it was in the context of
25
    approving some support for doctors in the abatement
```

program: Is it appropriate for the Legislature to consider whether there ought to be any obligations attached to that support? And I said, I think in general terms, yes, it is, because I think in general terms all of us ought to look at what we benefit from government, also at the same time look at what we can do to support the Commonwealth ourselves.

So I think a quid pro quo of some sort can be appropriate, but I'm not going to give you an opinion. Those are your decisions on whether any particular type of obligation is appropriate in relation to that particular program.

REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Well, with all due respect, I think clarity is the thing that's most absent in most of these Appropriations hearings.

So just to try to get direct answers, since you are the representative of the Governor here, is it the Administration's position that doctors must agree to take reduced rates under Cover All Pennsylvanians or else they would not receive the abatement?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative, let me check that, and we have another hearing starting within the half hour. We'll get you the answer to that question.

I don't know. The part of it that I don't know is your use of the word "reduced" in that sentence. I don't know whether we're talking about a reduced rate of support there. So let me check it, and we'll give you a precise answer in the 3 o'clock hearing that is on the health-care plan in general.

REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Well, to provide assistance with you on that answer, you can even remove my adjective of "reduced," just make it, is the Insurance Department and the Governor's position that doctors in Pennsylvania must accept the compensation rate provided under Cover All Pennsylvanians or they will not receive the abatement? Okay? That's a pretty clear question, and I'm sure Representative Keller can stand in to receive the answer in written or verbal form.

The other question I would like to ask you about that, you said, I believe in questioning of Chairman Micozzie, that there have been a number of meetings about the abatement for Mcare, and I'm just curious, when were these meetings and who has been to the meetings?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative, I believe most of the meetings have been among the provider groups looking at various options. I myself

```
1
    haven't been part of those meetings, but I know, I'm
    aware, that there have been a number of discussions
2
3
    going on among the providers about different ways to
4
    look at how we could fund both the Mcare abatement
5
    program, the Mcare phase out, and support the CAP
    program, that those three goals can be put together
6
7
    in various ways. And there have been discussions
    among the parties, because they all have a very
8
    direct interest in all three of those issues.
9
10
            REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Okay. Well, if
11
    you haven't been part of the meetings, who has been
12
    to the meetings?
            ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Again, I think
13
14
    they are mostly provider-oriented meetings.
15
            REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Has any
    consultation been made with the Governor's Office
16
17
    from these providers, to the best of your knowledge?
18
            ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Yes, yes, yes.
19
            REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: So the Governor's
20
    Office has had the meetings with providers, but not
21
    you?
22
            ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: There have been
23
    people from the Governor's Office as part of these
24
    meetings, yes.
25
            REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: And has any
```

legislative caucus been brought into these meetings?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: I don't know the answer to that.

REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Because based upon the conversation at this table, that the Republican Caucus in the House hasn't met with anybody on this topic since approximately January.

Representative Dally referred to the resolution which we had tried to have bought up in the House on the very last day of session, I believe in December. There's a bill, House Bill 489, that is sitting in the House Rules Committee right now which would directly address the abatement by March 31.

And your statement, I believe to Chairman Micozzie, was that we had time to address this. There's a bill sitting in the House Rules Committee, which Democrat leadership could bring out for a vote, which could clarify and remove the issue of the abatement.

Would the Governor and would you support them bringing that bill out of House Rules to allow us an up-or-down vote in the House on that legislation?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: No. I believe the issue of trying to work together on both the abatement program, the Mcare phase out, and the CAP

program or some form of addressing the uninsured, that those things ought to work in tandem.

That's my belief. It's still the Governor's position, too. Again, the Governor is showing great flexibility here, so I can't tell you what he may be open to in these discussions. But that, I think, is, from my perspective, a good position. It's the position I would support.

And as to the meetings, I think the characterization that I give to it is typically on an issue, my experience as the insurance regulator is I will try to meet with the parties most directly affected by an issue, kind of get a good sense of what the different options are, who might support and not support something, both to inform myself while on the kind of policy issues so that I can bring an informed judgment into the legislative process, and secondly, to have some sense of where the stakeholders' support may or may not lie. And I see that as necessary kind of groundwork to be efficient about using the direct legislative time and so forth.

So that's, I think, how I typically would do business on issues. I think that is basically what has been going on on this issue, trying to clarify absence.

Everybody knows that eventually the rubber meets the road in the General Assembly, and if anything is going to happen, it will have to be voted on by the members of this body, by the Senate, and signed by the Governor.

REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: And I appreciate that, Mr. Commissioner, and I appreciate the length of your answer, but I would also state that I think a lot of people are sick and tired of crisis production by the Administration.

We're sitting on March 4. We have until

March 31. As I understand it, you have not met

directly with the providers. You have not met with

the legislative caucuses on this issue. The

Governor's Office apparently has not reached out.

And this proposal that you had about extension of the abatement for 10 years, has that been introduced in legislation?

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative, that's the Governor's proposal from December 4. I don't know if it has been turned into specific legislative language, but it has been laid out in written form in great detail.

REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: So I take it -- and I understand that you may not know, you know,

```
1
    exactly every bill, and as I understand from the
2
    staff, there is not a bill on that subject.
            So you're now telling us on March 4, you
 3
4
    know, we have 20-some days to go until the deadline
    for the abatement. There has been no legislation
5
    that has been introduced from the Governor's
6
7
    position, and yet I believe 6 days after his budget
8
    address, he had legislation that this committee
    introduced for consideration on the cash grant
9
10
    program and on the RCAP legislation. But he has not
11
    seen fit to have the abatement language introduced in
12
    legislative form.
            So with that, I think I'll reserve the rest
13
14
    of my questions for Ms. Greco on the other matters on
15
    CAP.
16
            Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.
            Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
17
18
            ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO:
                                        Thank you.
19
            REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Thank you.
20
            Mr. Commissioner, thank you for coming here.
21
    Your answers were forthright and I think answered a
22
    lot of what the committee had questions on.
23
            You're going to stay. I'm sure we'll ask
24
    80 percent of them to Director Greco in about an
25
    hour.
```

```
1
            ACTING COMMISSIONER ARIO: And I'll be back
    here, too, at that point, so.
2
3
            REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: We're going to take
    a short break, a short recess. We'll be back in
4
5
    about 5 minutes for the Pennsylvania State Police.
6
            Thank you.
7
             (The hearing concluded at 3:10 p.m.)
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately in the notes taken by me on the within proceedings and that this is a correct transcript of the same. Jean M. Davis, Reporter Notary Public