1	
2	COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
3	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES INSURANCE COMMITTEE
4	
5	MAIN CAPITOL
6	ROOM 140 HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA
7	
8	PUBLIC HEARING HOUSE BILL 2455
9	COMMUNITY HEALTH REINVESTMENT
10	TUESDAY, MAY 4, 2010
11	9:00 A.M.
12	
13	BEFORE:
14	HONORABLE ANTHONY M. DELUCA, MAJORITY CHAIRMAN
15	HONORABLE DAN FRANKEL HONORABLE BRYAN BARBIN
16	HONORABLE FLORINDO J. FABRIZIO HONORABLE NICK KOTIK
17	HONORABLE EDDIE DAY PASHINSKI HONORABLE HARRY READSHAW
18	HONORABLE JOSH SHAPIRO HONORABLE MATTHEW SMITH
19	HONORABLE RICK TAYLOR HONORABLE NICHOLAS A. MICOZZIE, MINORITY CHAIRMAN
20	HONORABLE THOMAS H. KILLION HONORABLE BRAD ROAE
21	HONORABLE SCOTT W. BOYD HONORABLE ROBERT W. GODSHALL
22	HONORABLE GLEN R. GRELL
23	BRENDA J. PARDUN, RPR
24	P. O. BOX 278  MAYTOWN, PA 17550
25	717-426-1596 PHONE/FAX

```
1
     BEFORE: (CONT'D)
 2
     HONORABLE MARGUERITE QUINN
     HONORABLE CURT SCHRODER
 3
 4
     ALSO PRESENT:
 5
     HONORABLE DOUGLAS G. REICHLEY
 6
     ARTHUR F. MCNULTY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (D)
     CHERYL HALDI, RESEARCH ANALYST (D)
7
     STACIA LONGENECKER, LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANT (D)
     KATHY MCCORMAC, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (R)
8
                             BRENDA J. PARDUN, RPR
                             REPORTER - NOTARY PUBLIC
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	INDEX		
2	OPENING REMARKS AND INTRODUCTIONS	4	
3	HONORABLE TODD EACHUS	9	
4	MAJORITY LEADER PA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES		
5	KIMBERLY KOCKLER VICE PRESIDENT	20	
6	GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS BLUE CROSS OF NORTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA		
7	ROBERT E. BAKER, JR.	29	
8	SENIOR DIRECTOR GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS CAPITAL BLUE CROSS	2 3	
10	MICHAEL G. WARFEL	3 4	
11	VICE PRESIDENT GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS HIGHMARK	J 1	
12	CHRIS CASHMAN VICE PRESIDENT CORPORATE AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS INDEPENDENCE BLUE CROSS	42	
13 14			
15	JOEL ARIO	93	
16	INSURANCE COMMISSIONER PA INSURANCE DEPARTMENT		
17	SHARON WARD DIRECTOR PENNSYLVANIA BUDGET AND POLICY CENTER	121	
18			
19	RICHARD WEISHAUPT SENIOR COUNSEL COMMUNITY LEGAL SERVICES	135	
20			
21	CLOSING REMARKS	147	
22			
23			
24			
25			

## PROCEEDINGS 1 2 CHAIRMAN DELUCA: Good morning, ladies 3 and gentlemen. It's five after, and we'll call this meeting to order. And before I do that, I'd 4 like to start from my right, up here, for the 5 members to introduce themselves. 6 7 REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: Scott Boyd from 43rd District, part of Lancaster County. 8 REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Good 9 10 morning. Representative Eddie Day Pashinski, 11 Luzerne County. 12 REPRESENTATIVE FABRIZIO: Fabrizio, Erie County. 1.3 14 REPRESENTATIVE BARBIN: Bryan Barbin, 15 Cambria County. 16 REPRESENTATIVE KILLION: Tom Killion, 17 Delaware, Chester County. REPRESENTATIVE MICOZZIE: Nick 18 Micozzie, Delaware County. 19 20 CHAIRMAN DELUCA: Chairman Tony DeLuca 21 from Allegheny County. 22 Dan Frankel is eating his yogurt over here. And we also have --2.3 24 REPRESENTATIVE GRELL: Good morning. 25 Representative Glen Grell, 87th District,

Cumberland County.

1.3

2.3

REPRESENTATIVE READSHAW:

Representative Harry Readshaw, Allegheny County.

CHAIRMAN DELUCA: Again, ladies and gentlemen, let me welcome you to the House

Insurance Committee public hearing on House Bill
2455.

And as you are aware of, that this committee has been holding various meetings and certainly has been active, one of the most active committees in the house. And I want to commend them for their bipartisan support on legislation that we have put out.

This bill was introduced by Majority
Leader Todd Eachus, in recognition of the insurance
crisis that is brewing as we approach the end of
the calendar year. More specifically, at the end
of 2010, the Community Health and Reinvestment
Agreement, or CHR, will expire. The CHR is an
agreement which the four Blues plans signed with
the insurance department to fund the adultBasic
program and the major funding source for the
adultBasic program.

Ladies and gentlemen, adultBasic is a state-run program that helps provide health

insurance for low-income individuals.

1.3

1.5

2.3

If the CHR is not extended or a new funding source not identified, forty thousand to fifty thousand citizens of the commonwealth will no longer have insurance and will encounter new difficulties obtaining medical care.

Before turning to the agenda, I do
want to thank Leader Eachus for his introduction -excuse me -- of the legislation. Representative
Eachus has been a tireless advocate for health care
reform and has pursued quality health care
initiatives for all Pennsylvanians.

House Bill 2455 is just another example of the excellent leadership that Representative Eachus demonstrates on an issue that is crucial to every citizen and every family in this state.

But I also would be remiss if I did not thank the four Blue plans for their efforts on this issue. I'm sure that no one here today wants to see anyone lose their health care insurance. But, by the same token, I understand that the Blues have a responsibility to their policyholders and subscribers and must protect the physical integrity of their companies.

These competing interests have prompted my scheduling today the hearing. Needless to say, we have had some significant interest in the hearing, and I expect the witnesses to be very helpful and informative.

2.3

I want to remind everyone that the house session begins today at 11 o'clock, and we have much to get through.

With that, I'll ask my colleague, my minority chairman and my good friend,
Representative Micozzie, if he has any comments.

REPRESENTATIVE MICOZZIE: Thank you,

13 Mr. Chairman.

There's two conflicting issues that I'm concerned about. AdultBasic, of course, is very important in my district. In fact, former Representative Civera, myself, and Representative Miccarelli have a large list of adultBasic constituents. In Delaware County, I think I'm first.

And on the other side of the issue, which I'm concerned about, is that when you talk about just having the Blues fund the adultBasic, it concerns me, because the Blues are in dire straits already. And I have the most -- talking about

```
jobs, I have the most constituents in Delaware
1
2
     County that work for the Blues. So I'm concerned
3
     about both.
                   And I hope, Mr. Chairman, if you --
 4
     Mr. Chairman, Mr. Majority Leader, I hope that we
5
     can find some compromise where -- to keep
6
7
     adultBasic, to keep the -- I guess the fifty
     thousand, I think we're shooting for fifty
8
9
     thousand, but to spread the -- to spread the costs
10
     of the payments across the board to other -- to
11
     other entities so that I don't face, in my
12
     district, the layoffs of jobs, because jobs in
1.3
     Delaware County, especially the southeast Delaware
14
     County, are critical.
15
                   And sometimes I feel like a -- a
16
     person who has to give jobs out because my
17
     office -- my office continually has people coming
18
     in being out of work. So hopefully we can solve
     that problem.
19
20
                   Thank you.
21
                   CHAIRMAN DELUCA:
                                     Thank you,
22
     Representative Micozzie.
```

We have also been joined by 24 Representative Schroder, Representative Godshall, 25 Representative Taylor, Representative Roae.

2.3

Again, I want to welcome you, Majority Leader, and you may begin.

1.3

1.5

2.3

MAJORITY LEADER EACHUS: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. And it's an honor to be before the
committee. I got my start with you all. I'm
saying that, you know, when I started here in '96,
I had hair. So it's great to be back among old
friends and colleagues.

I'm glad to be able to discuss this critical issue with the committee today that really affects so many lives. The adultBasic program was conceptualized under the leader of both of you, in this committee, during the Ridge administration. It was a bipartisan bill that's was constructed after we received the tobacco settlement money, after the tobacco companies paid for the lawsuit against their — their arguments over two generations. That money was put in place in order to make sure that we prioritize health first, which was under that agreement.

Both of you gentlemen, the two chairmen, worked closely together to make sure that this has worked, and, in fact, it has. The adultBasic program is the only state program that provides accessible and affordable health care

1 coverage for adults who otherwise are unable to pay 2 for it.

1.3

1.5

2.3

As you know, the committee members, the adultBasic age is nineteen to sixty-four years old. It's a large segment of our population, yet there are still few options for affordable, low-cost health insurance access for average Pennsylvanians, notwithstanding what's happened at the federal law. Talk about that whole issue another day. We took responsibility in Pennsylvania long before our federal counterparts were ever talking about health insurance access, in a bipartisan way.

You know, we have children's health insurance that covers our kids, and this committee was essential in making sure that every child in Pennsylvania had access to the CHIP program. Our seniors have PACE and PACENET access to our innovative prescription drug program. Once again, another thing that this committee has done to make sure that we expanded prescription drug coverage, increased eligibility guidelines, and get the best deal for Pennsylvanians. We've done that better than anybody.

But why was the adultBasic program

of the undeniable need for access to health insurance. No matter how this health insurance debate has framed itself nationally, we know there is a need for affordable access. There's fifty thousand people who could currently be on this program — there's a little over — a little under that on the program right now. But it's undeniable that the need is there.

1.3

1.5

2.3

There are three hundred eighty-four thousand people on the adultBasic waiting list. There's over a million people now uninsured in Pennsylvania. And with every loss of every job, as the Chairman Micozzie so eloquently said, there's a loss of access to affordable health care. These issues are kind of preeminent in holding our society together.

A survey in 2008 showed that

Pennsylvania had nearly 12 percent of people

between nineteen and sixty-four years of age who

did not have health insurance. That number's

growing as our economy struggles. Sadly, more than

a million people are without health insurance

today, as I've said, and the number -- and the

numbers continue to climb with every loss of every job.

1.5

2.3

You ask why we're worried about this program, insuring fifty thousand lives in Pennsylvania. Why? You know, we've answered that, and it's simple, because the fifty thousand people are our neighbors. They're are brothers and sisters, our aunts and uncles who have -- are currently in this program. And they live in counties like Delaware and Erie and Lancaster and Luzerne. They're all over the commonwealth.

Why are we here, though? We're here because, you know, at the end of this year, in December 31st, the agreement that was signed between the Blue Cross companies, who have done a very good job of providing charitable care and charitable services to Pennsylvanians, offered an agreement, and that agreement worked like this:

Continue to provide the access of the dollars that we committed in the agreement in the tobacco settlement funds, which you have continuously done, and those will continue on for just under another decade. And the Blue Cross companies graciously, as part of their charitable mission, contributed a hundred fifty million dollars over five years to

the Community Health Reinvestment Agreement.

1.3

2.3

That agreement lapses at the end of this year. And with that lapse will mean for the fifty thousand lives that are covered under adultBasic program, your brothers and our sisters and our aunt and uncles, they will have no access. This program will shut off.

Frankly, the members of the committee and the members of the house, that's an untenable situation. In a world where we're trying to solve large problems in health care, we can't allow fifty thousand people to be placed in the street who currently have a state program that's been as effective as the adultBasic program, have those people placed out without insurance.

So what this bill that I've placed before you today does, it calls on the ability to find that balance to guarantee the investment from the Blue Cross companies, and in the hopes that we avoid any program dislocation for the people who need the health insurance. It's just that simple. The particulars you can discuss by the panelists today.

There is going to be a lot of concerns about, you know, the economy, the impact on the

companies who provide this charity care, and they've done a tremendous amount of charitable work within the commonwealth. It's part of the charitable mission. And what I'm asking for from this committee is an honest look at the road ahead and not wait until December 30th to act. Why? Because the people in this program deserve a proper transition, a proper answer on whether they'll have insurance on January 1st of 2011 or not.

1.3

1.5

2.3

And that's the core of this discussion only before your committee, decisions that you're going to have to make about how those resources are allocated, either through a model that I present to the committee today or through some other compromise which could be reached, are always up to the committee. I respect that.

But as the majority leader in the house and just an average guy from Hazleton, Pennsylvania, who's been lucky enough to work in health care policy for over a decade, this general assembly has made a commitment, a commitment to being leaders on health access for Pennsylvanians long before the fight nationally.

And I'm asking us to lead again. The bill that I placed before you provides a stark

choice for the decisions about reallocating priorities of dollars from the surplus the Blues currently have.

1.3

1.5

2.3

Today, our Blue Cross companies -- and maybe the numbers will be clarified -- the surplus is just under six billion dollars. We don't need much in order to transition the lives of the people who are in the adultBasic program to get between 2010 and 2014, when we're going to have to deliberate further on what the Pennsylvania model will be for the federal program.

I saw yesterday that Representative Shapiro kicked off his study commission that may be conceptualized here in the House to allow us to figure out what that program will look like, but we have work to do today on transitioning the federal program that was implemented in Washington and guaranteeing the commitment that we've made to the people of Pennsylvania that these lives will be covered, that that obligation is met, and the committee's work is done.

So, Mr. Chairman, I know you have a very concise schedule today, and, as you know, I'll be convening business on the house floor at 11:00.

I'll leave the deliberations to you.

But I do say this: It's not 1 2 acceptable just to say "no deal" for the people on 3 this program. That's not acceptable, just casting people -- again making forty thousand people part 4 of the ranks of the uninsured where we've met the 5 6 obligation and faced it head on in a bipartisan way 7 with the adultBasic program, made our commitment to being leaders in health insurance. Let's lead now. 8 9 And that's what I ask this committee to do, and I'm 10 very proud to be back before the committee to 11 discuss it. 12 CHAIRMAN DELUCA: Thank you, Mr. Leader. 1.3 And thank you for your testimony. 14 Usually we would be having our members 15 ask you questions, but I know you have a tight 16 schedule with especially the governor coming in and 17 the special session that we start at 11:00. 18 will be having hearings on the health care issue, and we certainly, any members -- pardon me? 19 20 REPRESENTATIVE SCHRODER: I had 21 requested to ask questions, Mr. Chairman. 22 CHAIRMAN DELUCA: You know what, 2.3 Representative Schroder, here's the problem. are on the floor at 11:00 o'clock. We want to hear 24

the other panelists. The leader has stuff to do.

He's things to do. I understand that he's 1 testified. 2 3 MAJORITY LEADER EACHUS: I'm also willing to come back at a day you have more time. 4 CHAIRMAN DELUCA: We'll have other 5 meetings where he can come back and discuss this 6 7 issue, but we'd like to hear from the other testifiers to find out. We're trying to ascertain 8 9 some information on this legislation. There'll be 10 plenty of time for us to ask questions. We can ask the leader -- if we all 11 12 start, we'll be here till 11 o'clock with just the leader. 1.3 14 MAJORITY LEADER EACHUS: In my --1.5 REPRESENTATIVE SCHRODER: 16 Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that. And you have 17 every right to control the committee, and I respect 18 that, and I'm not going to argue that any further. I would just point out that the leader 19 20 obviously decided to make himself available to the 21 committee and was not dragged here under duress or 22 anything, I'm sure. 2.3 And I would also say this: That the

leader has made many public statements about this

issue that I think need to be explored. And I was

24

just hoping to have the opportunity to do that 1 2 during this hearing. 3 Thank you. CHAIRMAN DELUCA: Well, we will be 4 having other hearings, Mr. Schroder. You'll have 5 plenty of time to question the leader in public. 6 And, certainly -- and I understand your situation. 7 I talked it over with the minority chair, and we 8 do, because of the situation -- he is the leader 9 10 and he, in fact, he has to run the House floor 11 calendar, we do have a special session, I think we 12 can give him that leeway. MAJORITY LEADER EACHUS: But I will 1.3 come back, Mr. Chairman. I'm happy to come back. 14 1.5 CHAIRMAN DELUCA: And I don't think that the leader will ever shy away from asking 16 17 questions, if I know him. 18 REPRESENTATIVE SCHRODER: As long as he comes back. 19 20 MAJORITY LEADER EACHUS: I'm happy to come back. There's nowhere to hide. 21 22 This is just the CHAIRMAN DELUCA: 2.3 start of the process. We have still -- as the 24 leader said, we want to make sure that we're ahead

of the game before December 31st comes, and the

same way we're going to have hearings on the national health care to get more information so we can decipher that. Nobody that I know of has any information that can tell you exactly what's in the bill.

1.3

1.5

2.3

We have a lot of work to do. And I'm sure that the leader will not shy away. He's not going to shy away today from any of the questions. I'd like to hear the other testifiers, because we only have a short period of time.

MAJORITY LEADER EACHUS: Thank you for the indulgence of the committee, Mr. Chairman. And I look forward to a return appearance to talk more in depth about my legislation.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN DELUCA: Thank you very much, Mr. Leader.

We do have on two other members of the committee, Representative Shapiro and Representative Quinn. I think I see Representative Kotik here.

It's great to see everybody here. I wish we could take this show on the road. We will have a full house, too. Unfortunately, I guess we have to have the hearings in Harrisburg to get a

full house.

1.3

The next individuals that will be testifying is the Blue panel: Kim Kockler, vice president of government affairs, Blue Cross of Northern Pennsylvania -- eastern Pennsylvania; Robert Baker, senior director, government affairs, Capital Blue Cross; Michael Warfel, vice president, government affairs, Highmark; and Chris Cashman, vice president, corporate and public affairs, Independence Blue Cross.

Welcome to all of you here today. And as I said, we will have more hearings, and we will have the leader here, to question him and grill him, and certainly if time permits, we will have you here, and then if we run out of time, we'll limit our questions to what we do for you too.

Okay. So, again, whoever wants to start, it's up to you.

MS. KOCKLER: Okay. And we'll just go in order, then, of the agenda that you have.

Thank you, Chairman -- Chairman

Deluca, Chairman Micozzie, committee members and

invited guests. Thank you for the opportunity to

be here.

My name is Kim Kockler, and I'm vice

president of government affairs at Blue Cross of
Northeastern Pennsylvania.

1.3

2.3

We are happy to be here today and happy to have the opportunity to comment on the program in question as well as House Bill 2455.

I'm here today because our company, Blue Cross of Northeastern Pennsylvania, is concerned about the ongoing viability, as you all are, of the adultBasic program, and because House Bill 2455, we believe, is deficient in terms of solving that problem. We ask that this committee please keep in mind the following points for purpose of not only today's discussion but our future debate on this issue.

Our company understands and appreciates the fact that the expiration of CHRA --

Representative Godshall -- if you could speak more into your -- Representative Godshall can't hear you. We try to accommodate all the members.

MS. KOCKLER: You bet. You bet.

CHAIRMAN DELUCA: Kim, excuse me.

Is this better? Very good.

I'll just start with the major points, as I was just starting to run down. We understand and appreciate that the expiration of the CHRA

agreement on December 31st of this year impacts the budget, the state budget, for 2010-2011 as it applies to funding the adultBasic program.

1.3

1.5

2.3

As an original participant from day one in adultBasic, we are concerned about the people currently enrolled in that program. We have about forty-five hundred of them in northeastern Pennsylvania, and we are very concerned about what their options and what this issue holds for them.

For more than seventy years, our company has been committed to our community, including those who carry our insurance coverage and those who don't. Our commitment to the health and wellness of the populations we serve in place -- were in place long before the CHRA and will be in place long after the CHRA.

The current adultBasic program represents an outdated health insurance model, and that's something I think we should spend some time on today, if we can, or in future hearings or whathave-you. It's an outdated model that hasn't been changed in nine years. None of us with the companies we have have products that we haven't changed in nine years.

We need the legislature to focus on a

sustainable and equitable solution for those

Pennsylvanians currently enrolled in this program.

1.3

1.5

2.3

Chairman, the majority leader gave you some background on the CHRA. I won't repeat all of that, but in order to evaluate the bill before us, we really have to understand the history of how the CHRA came about.

We signed this agreement, as he noted, in February of 2005, and, in short, it was intended as a time-limited agreement to help fund the adultBasic program. The CHRA proposed a 1.6 assessment on our commercial premium and another 1 percent assessment on Medicare and Medicaid products over the five-year period, less a deduction of the premium taxes we pay, which we will also talk about today.

Sixty percent our assessment directly supports the adultBasic program. The other 40 percent of that assessment was to be used to fund other community-based endeavors that support the un- and underinsured in our area.

For context, our total estimated contribution over the life of the agreement, speaking for our company only, is anticipated to be thirty-three million dollars, with twenty-three

million dollars in funding directly to adultBasic.

I'm sure you're going to hear those numbers from

all of us, and our companies, certainly, will -
you know, we'll all give you those respected

numbers, and they'll be larger for larger

companies.

1.3

2.3

Like most companies, BCNEPA will find itself in a much different financial position today than we were in 2005. For example, in 2005, we had a surplus of over four hundred million dollars. At the end of 2009, our surplus was two hundred fifty million dollars. A 40 percent decrease in the surplus.

We are also embarking on implementation of federal health care reform, the most major health care policy changes we've seen in the history of our industry. The impact of federal reform on our operations and our customers and on the costs of doing business are largely unknown. There will be thousands and thousands of regulations to come down. So we also need to look to that as we look to this particular proposal.

We are also operating in a national and state economy that's far less secure and stable than it was five years ago, as reflected by

diminished commercial customer base. You know, in short, we are not where we were in 2005. It's a different day for all of our companies.

1.3

1.5

2.3

Many represent that the CHRA and now House Bill 2455 are a, quote, unquote, fair substitution, since the Blues do not pay taxes. This is misleading and untrue. In fact, since 2005, BCNEPA has paid over thirty-five million in federal taxes. We also pay local taxes, even though we're not required to, so we're not totally tax exempt, tax-free organizations.

appropriate because the Blue plans are exempt from the state's premium tax. That is also not true.

Our company does pay premium taxes on our for-profit business and has, in fact, paid almost twenty million dollars in premium taxes since 2006. Only the business under our nonprofit companies, the Hospital Service Association of Pennsylvania and our first priority health HMO, are exempt from the state premium tax.

Examples of products that are offered under our nonprofit company are CHIPS, adultBasic of course, special care, which actually was the precursor. The Blues actually had special care,

which is much like adultBasic before the state required us to have anything. This was our voluntary commitment to the uninsured.

1.3

1.5

2.3

And also we have a product known as co-op, which is really our insurer of last resort product. When you can't get coverage elsewhere, this is where you come.

These products, ironically, those that are proposed to be taxed at 2.4 percent under 2455, enroll the most vulnerable of our members. It is important to understand that's where that tax is going to apply to those products.

Another important point for the committee to understand is that our community commitment is in no way fully defined by our -- by or limited to the CHRA agreement. Long before this agreement, Blue Cross of Northeastern Pennsylvania supported the product and programs we previously mentioned, those that enrolled the most vulnerable members of society and those that no other insurers will cover.

Over the last five years, we have subsidized these non-group products by over one hundred thirty-three million dollars.

It is true that the tax status of

BCNEPA as a nonprofit company has resulted in a fifty-five million dollar tax exemption from the state premium tax over the life of the CHRA.

However, as I said, you add up that one hundred thirty-three million dollars we've used to subsidize the other products, we've given out over six million dollars in grants to promote the health and wellness and help the uninsured in our areas.

1.3

2.3

So when you bottom line it for our company, for this fifty-five million privileged exemption, we've spent over a hundred forty million dollars. Not good math for even a not-for-profit company.

As we move forward in this debate, we would offer the following recommendations. The commonwealth's priority should be the development of a sustainable and fair solution for financing adultBasic and for all the challenges that face the program. The commonwealth should review the current program, take a look at the current program, which has been based on the same insurance model since the program's inception.

As I said before, you need to look at the program itself, perhaps change the benefits, consider many things you could do from an insurance

company perspective to change the program.

1.3

1.5

2.3

The commonwealth should also revisit its commitment to the adultBasic program, and Representative Eachus mentioned that, by restoring tobacco settlement funds, that it continues to decline over the life of this program. We should restore that funding back to original levels.

The commonwealth should explore any and all available funding now that comes through federal health reform, as was noted earlier. We don't understand all about federal reform yet. We don't know what opportunities may lie there.

But taxing those who purchase health insurance, and specifically only those who purchase insurance from the state Blue plans, is not the answer.

The amount BCNEPA would pay in taxes under House Bill 2455 will nearly triple the amount of our current CHRA commitment. Our customers are already challenged by the current economic climate and will bear the cost of federal reform such as the federal health insurance tax that is coming down. This is not sustainable for our customers or health care costs in northeastern and north central Pennsylvania.

The bill also oversimplifies the 1 2 complexity of the challenges that face the 3 adultBasic program. In short, Mr. Chairman, and in 4 conclusion, we are prepared to help in this 5 We have never walked away from our 6 7 commitment to the commonwealth. We're not doing that today. We are only saying, take a hard look 8 9 at the programs and take a look at the moneys that 10 may be available elsewhere before you put the 11 entire burden on those who pay for health insurance from the Blues. 12 1.3 Thank you. 14 CHAIRMAN DELUCA: Thank you, Kim. 1.5 Bob. 16 MR. BAKER: Good morning, 17 Mr. Chairman, and members of the House Insurance Committee. 18 19 Can you hear okay, Representative 20 Godshall? You all right? 21 Okay. Good. 22 Since you're already quite familiar with the essence of the discussion here this 2.3 24 morning, I thought it might be best if I spoke

directly to the issue of why the state's four Blue

plans cannot be expected to continue to fund the ongoing or possibly expand the adultBasic program.

1.3

2.3

Let me begin by responding to a statement made in the recent newspaper articles that said, in part: Knowing their nonprofit status puts them in a position to pay no business tax.

Capital Blue Cross is a not-for-profit company that competes directly with Highmark, another not-for-profit company, as well as numerous for-profit companies. We have some nine hundred thousand members and over two thousand employees. We have no -- unlike what you hear in Washington, we have no shareholders. We are not publicly traded nor do we pay dividends.

However, to say we pay no taxes is completely inaccurate. Capital Blue Cross is subject to federal and state income taxes and pays corporate net income taxes, capital stock taxes, premium taxes, and local taxes. In 2009 alone, we paid over twenty-five million in premium taxes, over two hundred sixty-five thousand in capital stock taxes, and nearly a million dollars in local taxes. The alleged exorbitant tax exemption that we receive from being not-for-profit is less than four million dollars and shrinking.

As important, we subsidize more than fourteen million in losses for our individual products, something our competitors do not do. We also subsidize ten million for our CHIP and our Medicare supplemental programs and for community health initiatives, such as clinics, childhood obesity, and senior outreach programs. We also contributed over five hundred thousand dollars last year to charity, such as the Pennsylvania Breast Cancer Coalition and the American Heart Association.

1.3

2.3

Overall, our community spending and taxes have risen from less than ten million dollars in 1999 to over fifty-two million dollars in 2008.

We are now facing an even bigger economic challenge. The federal health care bill calls for health insurers across the country to pay an extraordinary amount of new taxes to help balance the cost of the federal bill.

Beginning in 2014, insurers will be required to pay eight billion dollars in new federal taxes, with that number rising to 14.3 billion in 2018, with upward adjustments every year thereafter.

Since this is a new tax, we need to

begin preparing for it immediately. The cost to Capital Blue Cross will begin at an estimated thirty-five million dollars per year, rising to an estimated sixty-two million dollars by 2018.

2.3

As you know, the Blue subsidy of the adultBasic program is due to expire at the end of this year. Despite the signed agreement calling for an end to our involvement, both the governor's budgets and House Bill 2455 would require us to continue to subsidize the program at an even higher level than before.

The administration does this while reducing the amount of -- excuse me -- tobacco subsidy funds dedicated to the program each year from a level of seventy-four million in expenditures when the program began in 2005 to a proposed fifteen million dollars in 2010. This constitutes an 80 percent decrease in tobacco subsidy expenditures while seeking a substantial increase in contributions from the Blue plans, all while Capital Blue Cross's premium taxes paid to the general fund continue to rise.

For Capital Blue Cross, our CHR obligation would be an estimated fifteen million dollars. That's fifteen million dollars paid to

the CHR fund while paying over twenty-five million dollars in premium taxes to the general fund and subsidizing our individual offerings, state CHIP, our Medicare supplemental, and community health initiatives by more than twenty-four million dollars. Meanwhile, our non-Blue, not-for-profit and for-profit competitors pay nothing into the fund.

1.3

Capital Blue Cross would be willing to consider alternatives to fund the adultBasic program for an additional six months but not so long as 95 percent, instead of 60 percent, of the funding is to go directly to adultBasic and our non-Blue competitors are not required to contribute to the program.

We also strongly believe that the program should not be expanded, especially in light of the challenge the commonwealth faces in dealing with its own budgetary concerns. Further, if such financial demands are placed on us, we will have little choice but to raise rates, reduce or eliminate the subsidies of the programs already mentioned, and cut back significantly on community contributions.

Finally, we believe that the

commonwealth should return to funding the program

at the original tobacco fund expenditure level of

seventy-four million dollars annually.

Thank you for your time here this morning, and, of course, I'd be more than happy to answer any questions.

7 CHAIRMAN DELUCA: Thank you, Bob. 8 We'll get to that.

Mike.

1.3

2.3

MR. WARFEL: Good morning. I'm Mike Warfel, vice president of government affairs at Highmark.

Chairman DeLuca, Chairman Micozzie, and members of the committee, good morning.

I'm here to offer comments on House
Bill 2455 and discuss the reasons why we oppose
this legislation. While we have a long and proud
tradition of supporting efforts to increase the
number of Pennsylvanians who have health insurance,
we believe that forcing the state's Blue Cross and
Blue Shield companies to continue funding the
adultBasic program, as this bill proposes,
represents the misguided public policy.

We believe that all insurance carriers, not simply nonprofit health insurers, and

other private and public health care industry stakeholders have a shared responsibility to explore sustainable and fair solutions to deal with the health care needs of uninsured Pennsylvanians and those individuals and families currently in the adultBasic program.

1.3

1.5

2.3

Although Pennsylvania has historically had one of the lowest rates of uninsured among the fifty states, recent studies show that the number of people without health insurance is growing at a troubling rate.

This issue is very important to Highmark. As a nonprofit company, we have strived to provide coverage to a population that many insurers will not or are reluctant to insure, and to work cooperatively to improve the health and well-being of Pennsylvania communities.

We are constantly trying to achieve a very delicate balance between financial stability and upholding the commitment to small groups, individuals, and families who may not have insurance available to them.

To quantify Highmark's commitment to the community, I would like to review the past five years from 2005 through the end of 2009. During

this period, Highmark provided almost eight hundred million in community contributions, which included five hundred and eleven million dollars to fulfill the commitments under the Community Health Reinvestment Agreement.

1.3

2.3

How was the money spent? From 2005 through 2009, three hundred million in cash was provided to the state and used to support the adultBasic program. Another three hundred million has been used to expand access to health care coverage for lower-income families, seniors, and uninsured children under the state's Children's Health Insurance Program.

You are going to hear this morning, as an aside, from all the Blues that, in addition to the commitment we're making that CHR, each and every one of us are subsidizing the direct-pay programs. For Highmark in 2009, that number amounted to eighty-nine million. This is in addition to the sixty, sixty-five million in cash we're bringing to the commonwealth every quarter through direct transfers to the state treasury.

In addition, Highmark has provided grants, programs, and support aimed at addressing community health needs. Our funding reaches the

community primarily through nonprofit partners who are doing important evidence-based work and serving vital needs. Together with our partners, we support programs such as medical and dental clinics for the uninsured, health demonstration projects, and physical fitness programs for children.

1.3

2.3

Moving forward, we will continue to work to address the health care needs of the Commonwealth.

I'd like to take a moment to clarify a point that is often a source of confusion, again, a point I think very well amplified by Kim and Bob thus far. Highmark is a not-for-profit corporation, but we also pay taxes. Because of our nonprofit status, Highmark, but not our for-profit subsidiary, is exempt from some state taxes, most notably the state's insurance premium tax.

In 2009, the estimated savings resulting from the premium tax exemption was eighty-eight million. So let me be clear, if we were subject to the 2 percent premium tax, like every for-profit insurance company in the commonwealth, we would pay or extend to the commonwealth about eighty-eight million dollars. But like Kim and Bob have done for you, I'm going

to put that context in terms of the social mission giving that we're providing.

1.3

1.5

2.3

So, in 2009, the estimated savings, as I said, was eighty-eight million for the premium tax exemption, but the premium tax exception must be balanced against the community contributions that our company makes. Last year, for every dollar in taxes not paid because of the premium tax exemption, Highmark contributed one dollar and forty cents. Pretty good return on the investment for the commonwealth.

To further amplify the point about taxes, consider this, over the last five years, Highmark and its affiliates paid seven hundred twenty-seven million in federal, state, and local taxes.

So if there's anything that the members take from our conversations today, I hope we end this discussion and debate about the Blues don't pay taxes.

Any discussion to extend the term of the CHR agreement as the primary funding source for the adultBasic program must be viewed in broad context. Simply put, the environment today is far different, far more complex, and filled with far

more financial risk than the one in 2005, the year Highmark and the other Blue plan companies entered into the CHR agreement.

1.3

2.3

The staggering affects of the worst recession since the 1930s has created severe state budgetary pressures. We all understand that. And, of course, many private employers have dropped health care coverage for their employees. As a result, like many other companies, Highmark has lost membership in Pennsylvania.

Highmark is also being squeezed by hospitals and physicians who are feeling financial pressure, as reimbursements from government programs continue to lag behind the actual cost of providing new and more complex levels of care for the patients.

All too often providers try to offset lower public payments with higher commercial payments, which, in turn, makes health insurance less affordable for employers.

In addition to this hidden tax, the private insured also must bear the cost associated with bad debt and charity care provided to the individuals without insurance.

The jobless recovery and rapidly

changing health care landscape present financial challenges for Highmark as a time when we need even more capital to satisfy the demands of our customers, for goods and services, and to pay the new information technology and abilities to operate more efficiently. We also are incurring the greater costs to comply with the increasing number of government mandates associated with all aspects of our business.

1.3

1.5

2.3

As to all of this, also amplified by Kim and Bob, the newly passed federal health care law will place untold requirements on health insurance companies that we only are now beginning to grasp.

The law will change the health care system in profound ways: How people will buy insurance, how health care is paid for, including a variety of new taxes and/or expanded taxes, and how government regulates the health care system.

An underlying goal for health insurance reform in this new law is -- is uniform rate regulation for all health insurers as a means to promote fair competition in the health insurance marketplace.

In contrast, House Bill 2455 appears

to favor some insurers over others, by forcing only
nonprofit insurers, basically the state's Blue
Cross and Blue Shield companies and their
customers, to shoulder a larger part of the
financial responsibility for sustaining
adultBasic.

In light of the fragile economy and tremendous state budgetary pressures, you have a difficult decision to make relative to this legislation.

1.3

1.5

2.3

This CHR agreement was intended to be only a temporary funding solution to address the needs of the state's uninsured. It should not be viewed has a viable, comprehensive answer to a new, deep-seated question about whether the commonwealth can afford to maintain important programs such as adultBasic, given the financial challenges facing the state.

We will continue to meet our obligations under the CHR agreement until it expires at the end of December 2010, but we are opposed to a multiyear extension to the current agreement envisioned by this bill.

While Highmark realizes that the commonwealth faces financial pressures in

maintaining the adultBasic program, we believe all participants in the public and private health care sectors have a shared responsibility to draft a broad-based, sustainable funding source for adultBasic.

1.3

1.5

2.3

I thank you for your attention and be happy to answer your questions.

CHAIRMAN DELUCA: Thank you, Mike. Chris.

MR. CASHMAN: Good morning,
Mr. Chairman, Representative Micozzie, members of
the committee.

My name is Chris Cashman. I'm from

Independence Blue Cross and very pleased to be here
with you this morning to discuss House Bill 2455.

Independence Blue Cross opposes House Bill 2455, as it would extend an agreement that was always viewed as a six-year commitment. If enacted, 2455 would continue to place a disproportionate and unfair burden on Independence Blue Cross, and it would continue to impose a tax on our individual customers, many of who have lost jobs, and on our group customers, who are committed to offering health care to their employees but who are struggling in this difficult economy with

reduced revenues and increased cost.

1.3

1.5

2.3

I think, as all of you know,

Independence Blue Cross is based in southeastern

Pennsylvania. We cover 2.4 million members who

live in the Philadelphia region and 3.2 million

members nationwide. We employ fifty-two hundred

individuals and cover more than forty-five thousand

employer groups in southeastern Pennsylvania.

We provide our customers with a wide range of health plans. We are active in all lines of business, including individual health plans, small group and large group markets, Medicare, Medicaid, and guarantee issue plans, which we offer to people regardless of their health and which no other insurer in our region offers.

One of the factors that most clearly distinguishes us from our competitors is that we've always been committed to building the health of our community, which we call our social mission, work that, at its heart, serves those who are underinsured and uninsured.

It was part of that commitment, in 2005, that caused to us to voluntarily join with our colleagues, the other three Blue Cross and Blue Shield insurers in Pennsylvania, to enter into the

Community Health Reinvestment Agreement. We committed to a defined level of financial support for community reinvestment endeavors.

1.3

1.5

2.3

One of the primary goals of this agreement was to have fund -- was to fund adultBasic and other state-sponsored health insurance programs for low-income persons.

Since we entered into the agreement five years ago, we've always viewed it as a six-year agreement, one that afforded the commonwealth sufficient time to plan for and identify ongoing funding for these critical programs after the agreement expires.

During the term of this agreement, we have not only honored our funding commitment, but significantly exceeded it. From the agreement's inception, IBC has spent approximately four hundred twenty-four million dollars, combination of our commitment under the agreement and other additional community health activities, all work which we consider part of our social mission.

Of this amount, we spent approximately a hundred eighty-nine million on the CHIP and adultBasic programs.

The vast majority of the remaining two

hundred thirty-five million has been used by IBC to subsidize and make more affordable our guarantee issue health insurance plans, which we offer to people regardless of their health. There are plans — these are plans for individuals who are not only covered by employer-sponsored plans, people who often struggle to provide coverage for themselves and their families.

1.3

1.5

2.3

Beyond this, however, in 2010, we do expect to spend tens of millions of additional dollars in support of CHR and our social mission.

It's worth pointing out, as my colleagues have, that we spent this roughly four hundred twenty-four million during the term of the Community Health Reinvestment in addition to taxes we paid during this period. In fact, from the inception of the agreement, IBC has also paid two hundred fifty-nine million in Pennsylvania state premium taxes.

While we spend roughly four hundred twenty-four million on our social mission and paid two hundred fifty-nine million in premium taxes, we did not realize the tax exemption anywhere near this level of payment. In fact, from the beginning of the agreement until now, we've received a total

tax exemption of approximately fifty million dollars, or somewhere close to ten million dollars a year over the last five years.

1.3

1.5

2.3

I have attached to my testimony a slide which details the way in which we have broken down not only our CHR obligation, our social mission obligation and state premium taxes that we have paid, but juxtaposed, in yellow, the level of tax increase -- or tax exemption that we've received.

Over the five-year period, we spent four hundred twenty-four million in community health purposes or social mission. That's more than eight times the tax exemption that we see. If you add the premium taxes to that amount, we've spent almost fourteen times the exemption that we've received.

Market where our competitors pay premium taxes, but they're not asked to spend a single dollar to support the state's Community Health Reinvestment activities. All of this has also taken place as the economic climate and business conditions in our region have altered dramatically during the most severe economic decline since the Great

Depression.

1.3

2.3

So as we look at the expiration of the agreement in December, you can see the significant impact the agreement has had upon our company, our business, our customers, and our employees, and the unsustainable and inequitable burden the agreement creates on those entities.

Moving forward, we recognize the immediate budget implications that result from the expiration of the agreement in the middle of the commonwealth's 2010-2011 fiscal year. While IBC fully understands the adultBasic funding issues created by the expiration of the agreement and supports the public policy goal of reducing the uninsured, neither of these issues were created by IBC or the other Blue plans.

For that matter, as much as we might like to solve the challenges of the uninsured ourselves, we cannot solve it alone. Any solution needs the coordinated support and participation of the federal government, the commonwealth, and all health insurers, hospitals, health care providers who do business in the commonwealth.

As you consider alternate solutions, I'd like to highlight a couple of points that continue to come up and which were alluded to by the majority leader in a press release that he issued some days ago.

1.3

1.5

2.3

I mentioned we're not a charity.

Independence Blue Cross is not a charity. And as

I've said, we pay taxes. Although our corporate
operation is a not-for-profit, we pay local, state,
and federal taxes, just like for-profit health
insurers in Pennsylvania. In fact, congress took
away the Blue plans' federal exemptions in 1986.

In 2009, for example, Independence
Blue Cross paid 93.9 million in local, state, and
federal nonpayroll taxes, including the 52.1
million in Pennsylvania premium taxes.

While we're not a charity, we are committed to our social mission and serve the needs of our community. We're committed to supporting at least thirty-one nonprofit medical clinics in southeastern Pennsylvania. We're committed to supporting thousands of students who are struggling to pay nursing school tuition, and we're particularly committed to supporting the needs of the uninsured. And, you know, we don't intend to back away from that commitment beyond the expiration of this agreement.

I might also say a brief word about our surplus. You know, we're required to maintain a surplus by the Insurance Department. After about -- after nearly seventy-one years of service to our customers, Independence Blue Cross's level of surplus approached 1.6 billion dollars in 2009. That places us squarely within the efficient surplus range defined by the Pennsylvania Insurance Department guidelines, and, frankly, would only allow us to cover roughly sixty days of claims.

1.3

2.3

In fact, I think all of you know the PID is proposing to further strengthen its oversight regarding surplus levels, to make sure that the insurance industry in Pennsylvania does not have the same thin levels of capitalization that led to the disasters in the financial industry.

Unfortunately, we are not in a position to extend the agreement for three years. In an effort to help address the immediate budget implications that result from the expiration, I communicated last week to the chairman that, under certain conditions, Independence Blue Cross would be willing to discuss a temporary, six-month extension. This extension would include a limit on

IBC's participation that is equivalent only to our tax exemption, unless there is similar participation by all health insurers.

1.3

1.5

2.3

We believe, further, that the commonwealth should restore the level of annual support for adultBasic from the tobacco settlement fund at least to the seventy-four million dollars spent in fiscal year 2005-2006. As you know, each year since the Community Health Reinvestment Agreement was signed, the state has reduced dollars allocated from the tobacco settlement fund.

This year, in the current fiscal year,
I think the funding is at thirty-eight million
dollars, and the governor proposed to further
reduce funding from the tobacco settlement fund to
fifteen million dollars in this budget.

So we believe that before looking to other funding sources for adultBasic, the state should first use the tobacco settlement fund, as they were intended, for adultBasic.

Contradictory as it may seem for a company that's been dedicated for seventy-one years to build the health of our community through our social mission, we must reluctantly suggest also that the commonwealth freeze further expansion of

the adultBasic program, at least until the funding for this important program has been fully addressed by the general assembly.

1.3

1.5

2.3

I think all of you know that the governor has proposed in this year's budget to extend that funding from forty thousand to roughly fifty thousand, at a time when there's great uncertainty about the funding viability of this program.

Again, Independence Blue Cross has worked hard to be the company of choice for millions of customers living and working in southeastern Pennsylvania who need health care coverage. We look forward to serving the needs of our community long into the future and pledge to work with the general assembly, the administration, and all stakeholders to develop solutions to the challenges of the uninsured.

However, it is unreasonable to expect that an issue of this magnitude can be addressed solely by funding from customers of Pennsylvania's four Blue Cross and Blue Shield plans. It cannot.

If you codify this agreement as proposed, it will amount to a tax on our members, making health insurance less affordable for those

who purchase our plans. 1 2 In our view, addressing the problem of 3 the uninsured is a Pennsylvania problem, not merely a Blue problem. Accordingly, we recommend against 4 House Bill 2455. 5 I'm also happy to respond to any of 6 7 your questions. Thank you. 8 9 CHAIRMAN DELUCA: Thank you, Chris. 10 Thank all the panelists. 11 First person we are going to have ask 12 questions, Representative Schroder. I will forgo the questions as the chairman first. 1.3 REPRESENTATIVE SCHRODER: 14 15 Mr. Chairman, thank you. I would gladly yield, 16 seriously. CHAIRMAN DELUCA: 17 No. 18 REPRESENTATIVE SCHRODER: Thank you. Good morning, everyone. 19 20 First of all, I want to say, I think it's unfortunate that you had to come in here 21 22 today, you know, to basically defend your company's

honor and practices against what I think was a

pretty vicious political hit job by the majority

leader in the press. And unfortunately, I think

2.3

24

25

that's caused us to get off to a start where we have to do more education about, you know, facts and taxes that are paid and other commitments than actually, you know, discussing how we can actually move forward to preserve and save the adultBasic program.

1.3

2.3

Let me just ask a few clarifying questions. It's been stated that the Blues are nonprofits, yet my understanding, and I think it was mentioned in the testimony, is that legally, Blues are not-for-profit hospital plans or hospital corporations. They are actually exempted, under the Purely Public Charities Act, if I'm not mistaken.

Could someone take some time to explain, you know, what the difference between what the two really are and how it impacts this discussion?

MS. KOCKLER: This is going to be weak, but I'll do what I can.

Yes, we are not -- we are not charities. We do pay taxes, and as Chris said, we -- you know, our federal tax exemption was taken away in the 80s, I believe. We are not -- we are not -- I guess when you look at us, you can say --

you know, think of United Way. We are not United Way. Then, on the other end of the spectrum, we're not a company that has shareholders and shareholder meetings. We're in the middle of that.

1.3

1.5

2.3

We are not totally tax exempt. We pay payroll taxes. We're like any other business in those respects. The only exemption we have is from state premium tax on our for-profit business -- on our not-for-profit business. So those products we mentioned -- CHIP, adultBasic, insurer-of-last-resort products -- is where our tax exemption lies. That's it. That's the difference.

MR. WARFEL: And I think Kim's done a fine job explaining.

One other practical example of our tax exemption for someone like Highmark, where most of our business still rests in the large not-for-profit holding company, is the state sales tax.

So, Representative, we would not pay the state sales tax on that business and transactions that occur in support of that large not-for-profit holding company-type business.

So the sales tax we would be exempted

from. As Kim already noted, we would not pay the premium tax. Highmark would not pay the premium tax on our not-for-profit, quote, business, if you will.

1.3

2.3

And I think one other important point, I think all of us are voluntarily paying local property taxes. As the members know, where we have our facilities -- for Highmark, it's substantial facilities across the commonwealth -- we voluntarily pay property taxes. Although, as I understand the law -- I'm not an attorney, none of us are attorneys -- we don't pay property taxes, but we do that voluntarily. We do pay -- we do pay that, but we do that voluntarily.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHRODER: And the for-profit subsidiary, as some or all of you might have, you pay the business taxes to the state.

MR. WARFEL: Premium taxes.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHRODER: Now, it's been talked about a six-billion-dollar surplus. I think I heard, perhaps, Mr. Cashman say that that represents just under two months of surplus. Is that six-billion-dollar figure inclusive of all the Blues sitting there at the table, as far as what the surplus of reserves?

MR. BAKER: I'm not certain who came up with the number, but I can say we have between two and a half and three months.

1.3

2.3

 $\label{eq:REPRESENTATIVE SCHRODER:} So \ \mathsf{two} \ \mathsf{and} \ \mathsf{a}$  half to three months.

Is there an -- I guess what goes to my question, is there an industry standard or a federal or state standard as to how many days worth of surplus, how many days worth of claims payments a company should have?

MR. BAKER: Well, we're required to meet the standards set by Blue Cross/Blue Shield Association. We're also required to meet the standards set by the Pennsylvania Insurance Department, and this body commissioned the Lewin Group to do an analysis some years back to find out how that fit in -- how we fit in that, and they found that we were all in the proper range for surplus, which you must maintain.

An extreme example of why would be in the Louisiana Blue Cross/Blue Shield program. When they had Hurricane Katrina, nobody was paying their bills but the claims were still coming in. And because of their surplus, they were able to meet all their obligations. Hopefully, we'll never

experience that type of event, but there are other events that could cause problems.

1.3

1.5

2.3

MR. CASHMAN: Representative Schroder, while it may not be etched in stone, I think, generally speaking, the industry standard is that a plan should have a minimum of ninety days or three months. But, I think, you know, it's fair to say that some even — some in our insurance department have opined recently that there's really no amount of surplus that's too much. And we tend to agree with that, although, as I mentioned, we maintain our surplus to be able to cover roughly sixty or a little less than sixty days, so it's not — we don't stock pile it. It's — it's there to cover that level of claims.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHRODER: Is there any -- final question I have, was there any expectation, either explicitly stated in the Community Health Reinvestment Agreement or perhaps implied during the negotiations of that six years ago, whenever it took place, that the Blues would continue to fund adultBasic beyond the six-year timeline for that agreement? Like I said, either explicitly or implied.

MS. KOCKLER: I would say for us, no.

MR. CASHMAN: We are certainly not aware of any notion that we would go beyond the six years.

1.3

1.5

2.3

REPRESENTATIVE SCHRODER: Yet, if I understand, as I think I understand your collective testimony, you're willing to continue a commitment to adultBasic, but you just feel that you cannot shoulder the entire burden. Does that sum up sort of the collective message?

MR. WARFEL: I can only speak for Highmark. I think we did not specifically address any kind of extension. I think my testimony was clear, we agreed to a six-year commitment, and we will honor the commitment we made when we signed the agreement six years ago.

You've heard others here suggest that recognizing the inelegant provision for a timeline for the agreement doesn't really match up with the state fiscal year, and, you know, thinking back to when the agreement was negotiated, I don't think anyone really thought that far ahead in terms of that would create a conflict in terms of the state's fiscal year begins July 1 to June 30, and the agreement's based on a calendar year, and that how to reconcile our contributions annually to the

insurance department. So it's sort of based on a calendar year. It sort of matches.

1.3

2.3

The way our fiscal year, as private companies works, we operate on a calendar year fiscal year, and the state, of course, does it differently.

So, from Highmark's perspective, I'm not going to foreclose the opportunity that a six-month extension is impossible, but I think that there needs to be a demonstration by the legislature and all the stakeholders that this, as Chris put, is not just a Blues solution but is a commonwealth solution.

And, you know, we can -- I mean, you've heard from the collective witnesses here the kind of thought that needs to go into this. Why are we moving less and less money from the tobacco settlement, a program that was designed to support this program? You know, why aren't we looking at reforming benefits? Is the premium of thirty-five to thirty-six dollars a month adequate in today's world? Where can anyone buy a policy for thirty-five, thirty-six dollars a month?

So I think, Representative Schroder, that's the kind of creative thought that we may

need to go into this debate, not just simply saying, Blues, tag, you're it. And continue this infinitum.

1.3

2.3

MS. KOCKLER: And if I could just add a little bit to that, and I would echo what my colleagues have said, before we take that step we are only asking that we do the homework.

We don't really understand, sitting here today -- and if somebody does, I'd like to hear it -- we really don't understand the budget number we're trying to get to either with this program. We are not sure. We understand there was some surplus in that fund at one time. We're not sure where it is now. We don't really know the real number we're trying to achieve.

we're trying to achieve, and on top of that,
putting more and more people into the program at
this point, again, I think that is a problem as
well. You're continuing to pile people into a
program that is on very, very shaky ground. Until
we know those things, we're not really willing to
go to the end game of extensions or anything
further at this point.

MR. CASHMAN: And if it's -- if it's

okay with the committee, I just want to clarify that what our position at Independence Blue Cross is, it's that recognizing there's this discrepancy, this six months' discrepancy, you know, we're willing to continue to participate to try and help the commonwealth address this — this unique situation. But we're only willing to participate up to the value of what our tax extension would be for that period of time. We're not saying we will — we will extend the current agreement. In fact, we are not prepared to extend the current agreement. But we are willing to try and help the commonwealth bridge whatever gap exists for that six-month period.

1.3

1.5

2.3

 $\label{eq:REPRESENTATIVE SCHRODER: I thank you} % \begin{center} \begin{center} \textbf{For your comments.} \end{center}$ 

Obviously, there are a lot of issues that we have to look at. Certainly want to see those with adultBasic continue to get the insurance that they need. I don't think anyone wants to see them, you know, kicked off of the coverage. So we obviously have our work cut out for us, trying to figure out how to basically extend the program past the six-year agreement that was -- that was entered into, and, hopefully, we'll be able to proceed

along with discussions with Blues companies as well as others, taking a look at tobacco fund issues and things like that, to determine a direction.

Thank you.

1.3

CHAIRMAN DELUCA: Let me just ask the panel here. Since it is going to expire -- we're in May already -- and it's going to expire on December 31st. Do you intend to notify the individuals who you insure that they're going to be without coverage end of December 31st? And if you are, when are you going to send out the notices? Have you thought of it?

MS. KOCKLER: I think that would have to be done in consultation with the Department of Insurance, because --

CHAIRMAN DELUCA: Have you discussed having the Department of Insurance to send out notices?

MS. KOCKLER: No.

CHAIRMAN DELUCA: Or just say to individuals, December 31st, get a shock, because everybody doesn't read the paper, everybody doesn't get the Internet. They get a shock, they have no more insurance.

Is that part -- have you -- are you

```
going to discuss with the administration?
                                                 So who's
1
2
     working this out, to notify these individuals that
     they're not going to have insurance? You have
3
     forty thousand plus that should be warned that
 4
     they're not going to have insurance December 31st.
5
     Wouldn't that be fair to notify them ahead of time,
6
7
     not to the last month?
                  MS. KOCKLER: There is -- I believe
8
     there is a requirement that we have to do that --
9
10
                   CHAIRMAN DELUCA:
                                     Is there a
11
     requirement --
                   MS. KOCKLER: -- in a time certain.
12
1.3
                   CHAIRMAN DELUCA: What is the time
     certain?
14
15
                  MS. KOCKLER: I think there's a thirty
     or -- I think it's a thirty-day notification that
16
17
     that would happen. But, Chairman, we really hope
18
     we don't get to that point.
19
                   CHAIRMAN DELUCA: We hope, too, but I
20
     just want to know. You know, thirty days doesn't
21
     seem pretty fair to me for somebody to go out there
22
     and try to find some health care insurance.
     can't find it.
2.3
24
                   And I think, if that's the thirty
25
     days, I would hope that this panel would -- and I
```

will talk to the administration, too, because I don't think thirty days is enough, if we can't come up with some type of agreement.

1.3

And let me just say this. This is a starting point. You know, you got to give the majority leader credit for his starting the process, because, let's face it, there's going to be a new governor next year and possibly who knows what else. And that governor's going to face a budget deficit, pension crisis, and other things.

And, sure, if you want to play politics, we certainly would say, Well, let's leave this up to the next governor, and let him throw out forty to fifty thousand individuals on the street. But that's not what we are sitting up here for. We're sitting up here to be responsible legislators.

certainly could do that and say, Hey, let's leave it to the next governor. Maybe -- from all the things that we hear, maybe the next governor comes in and he's here eight years, things turn, and maybe it would be beneficial. But that's not what people sent us to do, so we got to get -- we need to start this process. And that's why -- that's

the start.

1.3

2.3

The majority leader's bill is a start. It's not current -- and maybe it is all but trying to work in good faith. I commend every one of you for working in good faith. But we do have to come up with a solution.

And I would personally talk to the administration to find out. Thirty days is certainly not acceptable, and we have to give them enough time to let them know that these individuals are going to be without health care.

And so, hopefully, you will be working with the administration, too, on that issue.

Representative Micozzie.

REPRESENTATIVE MICOZZIE: Thank you.

Yes, on the issue of surpluses, what seems to be -- has gone back and forth with the administration and the Blues. You alluded to the -- there's a question whether it's ninety days or whatever as far as how much surplus you have. Evidently, the administration has a different opinion, because they seem to -- in a crisis, they go after your surplus.

Now, explain to me -- explain to me what is your policy as far as surplus. What goes

into the surplus? Surplus means extra money. What is that extra money?

1.3

1.5

2.3

MR. WARFEL: Well, in simplest terms, Chairman Micozzie, surplus is basically moneys that are set aside to pay future claims. And so, as Chris described earlier in response to a question, I think generally, and this is Highmark, we try to maintain about ninety days of payments that would be used to pay future claims.

Now, it's further monitored by the insurance department with the risk-based capital. The commissioner is up here next, who can far more eloquently describe the risk-based capital monitoring process. But, essentially, the surplus is used to pay future claims.

The challenge for you all in the legislature and for the executive branch invested in the commissioner is to balance how much reserves are really required to pay future claims. And if those reserves get too high, do you really owe your customers a refund?

To bring that to focus, the federal health care reform law that was just signed into law last month, beginning next year, insurance companies are going to have to publicly disclose

how much they're actually spending on medical care and how much they spend on administration. So it's call medical loss ratio.

1.3

1.5

2.3

So there will be -- there will be more transparency, and there will be more openness in terms of how those numbers work, Mr. Chairman. And so, I think that will probably settle itself out, because the general public's going to know and employers are going to know just exactly what your medical loss ratio is.

And the law says that if medical loss ratio levels aren't met, a certain level, or if they're exceeded, then there will be refunds due to the customers. None of us know how those refunds will work and if those refund come back to the employees in terms of a dividend return, if you will. Are those -- do they come back to employers, in terms of a premium reduction? That all has to be defined.

As Kim said, there will be thousands of pages of regulations to deal with all this.

But does that help you?

me. I understand that point.

But what's the disagreement with the

administration and the Blues as far as what they 1 2 consider too much surplus and you consider it's not 3 enough? MR. WARFEL: I think at this point, 4 I'm not suggesting, at least from my perspective, 5 there's a disagreement with the insurance 6 commissioner and his staff as to what our surplus 7 is or should be. We are operating within a limit 8 9 or a range that was established some years back. 10 So, Mr. Chairman, I don't know that --11 REPRESENTATIVE MICOZZIE: 12 happened last year or the year before when they 1.3 went after your surplus? 14 MR. WARFEL: When that -- when that --15 of course, that was some six or seven years ago 16 that that --Time flies. 17 REPRESENTATIVE MICOZZIE: 18 MR. WARFEL: It does. And how that was resolved, Mr. Chairman, was that the 19 20 commissioner established a risk-based capital 21 monitoring system that really was recommended and 22 formed by the National Association of Insurance 2.3 Commissioners. And you all passed legislation that 24 actually gave him the tools to do that financial 25 solvency monitoring.

```
So I suggest to you, respectfully,
1
2
     I -- from my perspective, I don't know that there's
     a disagreement between Highmark and the
3
     commissioner with surplus.
 4
                   MR. BAKER: The surplus also serves
 5
     other functions. For example, we want to put a new
6
7
     computer system in to make us more efficient,
     because one of our goals, of course, is to get
8
9
     physicians and hospitals paid on time, that has to
10
     come out of that money there. If we -- if we would
11
     need to build a new building, it has to come out of
12
     that money there.
1.3
                   Again, we can't float stock, because
14
     we don't have stock. So it serves a lot -- if we
15
     misjudge, if our actuaries make an error and all of
16
     a sudden we lose money where we thought we were
17
     going to make it. That's got to come out of
18
     there.
                   So, you know, it serves a lot of
19
20
     purposes and not just -- and not just to -- in case
     of a severe incident?
21
22
                   CHAIRMAN DELUCA:
                                     Representative
2.3
     Shapiro.
24
                   REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO:
                                             Thank you,
25
     Mr. Chairman.
```

Kim, you had testified earlier about the outdated model, I think is what you referred to adultBasic as. In some of the other testimony today, obviously we heard about concerns from across the panel about continuing on with the approach that's in the house bill that the leader put before us.

1.3

1.5

2.3

Putting aside how it is funded and for how long it is funded, putting aside that for a moment, I guess my question is, sort of touching on your outdated model point of view, is this even the right way for us to go about helping those who need a helping hand from the government to purchase health insurance, in the sense that are we maximizing the dollars, whether it's your dollars or someone else's, utilizing this model? Is there a different model that you'd suggest approaching?

I don't want to come at this problem from a standpoint of, where do we find funding, if the foundation upon which we're doing this is flawed. And my sense from the comment that you made was, that wasn't a throw-away line. You truly meant that, and it is flawed.

So maybe you could dive a little deeper into that and talk about that and maybe this

committee can address that going forward.

1.3

MS. KOCKLER: Sure. I'd be happy to.

What we mean by that is, and the very name of the program adultBasic, the benefit package is not basic; it's quite good. It's -- when you compare to what we have in -- we sell to commercial customers today, it's a good benefit package. It's very rich, in a sense.

There is -- until March 1st of this year, there was no cost sharing in this program, other than your thirty-five, thirty-six dollars you paid. You paid no co-pays. You didn't -- you didn't cost share as much as commercial -- whoever's insurance you have, whatever company you have, you have costs, sharing. You have tiered pharmacy benefits, different cost sharing. There was none of that.

So there are ways, I think, we can apply what we've learned commercially to this program, as well as, you know, I think we do need to scale it down, scale it back, and stop putting a lot more people in and releasing, you know, thousands of people off waiting lists at this point, because of the unsurity.

I'd like really to get a handle around

the modeling, the options for maybe sliding scale
premiums, maybe thirty-six and a fifty and -- I
mean, there are a lot of options you can talk about
to make the model work better.

But, again, you're looking at -- what

2.3

we're looking at today is, you know, we need to fund it. But you're absolutely correct, we really feel, if you looked at the parameters of the program itself and how it was formulated and how it runs, maybe there is some room there to make this more efficient.

REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: Are there any other thoughts from any of the panelists on that?

MR. WARFEL: I would just add,
Representative Shapiro, I know that on the senate
side of the building, there -- I think just
yesterday a high-risk pool bill was passed and it's
coming to your committee.

## REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO:

Representative Kotik is doing that here in the house.

MR. WARFEL: Yes. And so -- and so a state-based, high-risk pool potentially is a solution that you should consider.

Another solution is a temporary high-

risk pool that the federal government is bringing to the state as an option, along with federal health care reform, which has provided the commonwealth a hundred sixty million dollars, we understand, until 2014.

1.3

1.5

2.3

And you may actually think outside the box and think that the current adultBasic health insurance model that you're offering maybe should be changed. Maybe we need to think about a catastrophic hospital plan, or -- I mean I appreciate -- if you're question is, you're not necessarily committed to the current benefit design and perhaps we should look at some other ideas, then, yeah, I think that's certainly worth a look.

REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: Let me be clear, Chris. I'm sorry to cut you off. But let me just be clear. I'm not saying I'm not committed to the current program. What I'm saying is, if there's a finite amount of dollars out there, that's essentially what you're saying, there's a finite amount of dollars, and, you know, we don't want to be on the hook for all of it, the way that this legislation suggests.

What I'm wondering is if we can get whatever dollar you're putting into the system to

be maximized and be more efficient at it. 1 2 sounds like Scott Boyd, but -- my friend, Scott Boyd. But I guess, as we are looking at the 3 funding mechanism, what I'd like to hear more from 4 you about today and going on is, you know, how can 5 we or what would you suggest we do to the 6 7 underlying parameters of the program to make it more efficient, to make those dollars go further? 8 9 So I don't want anybody to think that 10 I'm walking away from the adultBasic, I'm certainly 11 not, but I just want to make sure the program's as 12 efficient as it can be. 1.3 Chris, I'm sorry. I may have cut you off. 14 15 MR. CASHMAN: Well, Representative 16 Shapiro, all I would say is -- your question is 17 really the important question. I mean, as -- as we 18 sit here today trying to solve a funding issue, unfortunately, we've not challenged ourselves, I 19 20 quess, to focus on the broader question of what's How do you define the "it" that we're 21 the "it"? 22 trying to challenge? 23 And as we sit here today with this 24 discussion and with the discussion occurring on the

other side of the chamber about high-risk pools and

25

as we sit here and think of the future and look into the future and see federal health care reform come, I think it is the time.

1.5

2.3

that.

It presents us with an opportunity to think about, you know, whether the package, whether the adultBasic program that we all proudly supported over the last five, six, seven years, even before this agreement, and will support in the future to some extent, whether it's really the right program for -- for those who need it the most.

And we're willing, obviously, to continue, as we always are and I think all of us are, to help the general assembly and administration think about ways to address this issue.

But I think if we have a message here today, there's really nothing that separates us any longer from our for-profit brothers and sisters.

They should be at the table, too, helping to -- helping to solve this challenge that we have all.

REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: I agree with

Just one final question, if I could ask, Mr. Chairman. You and Mike had each talked

about the high-risk pool maybe being an avenue here. I mean, my understanding -- I may have this wrong, I don't think I do -- is that you have to be uninsured to get into that high-risk pool. How would you propose we, you know, meet that gap there?

1.3

MR. WARFEL: Yeah, I think -- let me be clear, Representative. When I use the term "high-risk pool," there are two types of risk pools. There are state-based risk pools that have been in place in many states, well over thirty, I think, for years. That's certainly an approach that you all can take, as you look to find ways to provide benefits between now and 2014, when these health-based exchanges come into vogue with the health care reform bill.

Under the temporary federal high-risk pool, it specifically says in the law that you must go there for six months before you are eligible for the benefits. Creates another challenge.

But you really, I think, respectfully, need to think about, there are two high-risk pool concepts on the table here. There are state-based risk pools, which will have their own funding challenges, where to find the money to fund it.

And then there's a temporary high-risk pool. 1 2 And then the real rhetorical question is, what happens to the high-risk pools come 2014? 3 Do you still maintain a state-based risk pool or 4 not? I mean, these are -- we don't have answers to 5 those questions. 6 7 REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: Hopefully, with the expanded Medicaid, that would address 8 that. 9 10 MR. CASHMAN: The only thing I would 11 add -- and I know we want to move on here -- is 12 that under the federal high-risk pool, in addition 1.3 to being uninsured, you have to have a preexisting 14 condition. And, you know, I think some of us 1.5 believe that the adultBasic waiting list provides 16 fertile ground for identifying people that would 17 qualify for both of those -- both of those 18 criteria. 19 REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: Thank you. 20 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 21 CHAIRMAN DELUCA: You're welcome. 22 Representative Killion. 23 REPRESENTATIVE KILLION: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I will be brief. 24

First want to thank you for your

25

testimony. As you walk the halls, and we're all worried about not putting forty thousand people off the adultBasic, you guys have become an easy target. You heard the majority speaker make a point, you have a six-billion-dollar surplus.

1.3

2.3

In testimony before the Appropriations Committee, insurance commissioner came out that you didn't pay taxes. I want to thank you for dispelling those myths.

I'm worried about jobs, like

Representative Micozzie. The Blues last year, IBC lost seventy-nine million, nine hundred people less. Times are difficult. When you signed this agreement, the Dow was on its way to fourteen thousand. So you're clearly not getting the same returns.

What do you see happening if you have to do this? You're either going to have to decrease costs by laying off people or increase premiums. Is that an accurate statement? Is there any other way to go?

MS. KOCKLER: I think this does get added to our customers' bills, at this point. It's an add-on now.

We may have been able to do this

without charging customers in the past. We are in a different position than 2005. This is only speaking for our company. But we will have to pass this on now.

1.3

2.3

The federal reform is staring us in the face, and all the other things we have to do, and the surplus being much less than it was, there's really not any other way to do this than to build it into premium. And I think we all are looking at efficiencies in terms of the number of people we employee at our company at this point.

MR. WARFEL: And if I may,

Representative, I think one additional thought, as

I mentioned in my testimony, we spent -- in 2009,

we spent almost ninety million subsidizing, that is

buying down premium rates for direct pay

customers. So this is Medigap rates for seniors,

those kinds of things.

There is only so much money at the end of the day that we can drive into these programs. So there's probably an area, that ninety million or so that we're voluntarily, you know, offering on the table through our direct subsidies, we'll be challenged to maintain that effort. So that's going to obviously impact your constituents across

the board as well potentially.

1.3

1.5

2.3

MR. BAKER: And I would just say, your statement is accurate.

REPRESENTATIVE KILLION: Thank you.

And as you look at the employment in our region, Philadelphia, forty-nine hundred people from IBC; in Delaware County, twenty-four hundred, a hundred fifty-six of them live in my district. So we all want to solve this problem. We want to protect the forty thousand people that have been added to adultBasic but not at a cost that's inappropriate.

I think we need to work together, both sides of the aisle, to come up with a solution so we can solve this problem.

I do have to say, though, we are hearing "crisis," this "crisis." We've got the 12/31 cliff where the forty thousand people are going to fall off. My definition of crisis is something that happens all of a sudden that you didn't anticipate.

This agreement was entered into in 2005, with an expiration date of 2010. It's not like we didn't know this was coming. And I think the administration should have been working on this

a whole lot sooner, and at the same time, shouldn't have been adding more and more people to adultBasic when we didn't have a solution.

1.3

1.5

2.3

And now we're in the middle of a major financial crisis here in the commonwealth. And I mean, I sit on the Appropriations Committee. The numbers are mind boggling, the deficit we're looking at, and it doesn't seem to be getting any better right now.

And I think we need to make sure that whatever we do, whatever we do, we don't hurt employers in Pennsylvania.

And I want to also thank the Blues.

IBC has been a great corporate citizen in the southeast, as the others have been in Pennsylvania. But I think we all need to work together so the burden just isn't put on you to fund this program, as it has been for the last five years, and that we find the solution where we all pitch in and make sure we keep those forty thousand people covered.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DELUCA: Just so, in my mind,
I have this right, if forty thousand people go off
the uninsured rolls, I mean go off adultBasic, does

```
our premiums go up for anybody if they happen to
1
2
     increase the people going into the emergency
     rooms? Do we -- do you have to pay for that?
 3
                                                     Do
     you raise premiums on individuals for uncompensated
 4
 5
           Or do you -- I mean, you pay the hospitals
     more because of the fact, and to recoup that, you
 6
 7
     would have to raise premiums; am I correct?
                   What is built into that premium right
8
     now for uncompensated care? About 9 percent?
9
10
                   MR. WARFEL: Mr. Chairman, I don't
11
     know what the actual percentage is.
12
                   CHAIRMAN DELUCA:
                                     There is a
13
     percentage built in, am I correct, if there's --
                   MR. WARFEL: Uncompensated care is
14
15
     certainly a factor in terms of premiums. In some
16
     areas, obviously, uncompensated care is going to be
17
     higher in center city Philadelphia than it is going
18
     to be in certain other areas of the commonwealth,
19
     so, yes, it's part of the premiums.
20
                   CHAIRMAN DELUCA: What I'm trying to
     say, Mike, is the fact is that if we don't do
21
22
     anything, you're going to raise -- as
2.3
     Representative Killion said, he's worried about the
     employers -- we are going to raise the rates.
24
25
     There's no two ways about it, because you're not
```

```
going to be able to absorb more money that the
1
2
     hospitals are not going to absorb.
3
                   So let's not think it's a free lunch
     out here.
               If we just put these people off, we
 4
5
     don't have to pay anything. And that's not going
6
     to happen.
7
                  MR. BAKER: I don't think,
     Mr. Chairman, any of us are suggesting that we put
8
9
     these people off.
10
                  CHAIRMAN DELUCA: No, I understand,
11
           I just want to bring that to the --
     Bob.
12
                  MR. BAKER: We're sympathetic to them.
13
     I don't know how you show relationship between the
14
     two that you're describing, but we're sympathetic
     to this.
15
16
                  At the same time, we signed the
     agreement. We lived up to the agreement.
17
18
                  CHAIRMAN DELUCA: I understand.
19
                  MR. BAKER: And this is, as
20
     Representative Killion said, this is not something
     new, and we think that there's possible solutions,
21
22
     but it's got to involve everybody.
2.3
                  CHAIRMAN DELUCA: I understand.
24
                  Representative Pashinski.
25
                   REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI:
                                              Thank you,
```

Mr. Chairman.

1.3

1.5

2.3

And thank you all for your testimony.

I have heard some very good things here today. One, Representative Shapiro indicated that he sounded like Representative Boyd. I may end up sounding like that too, just as long as I don't look like Representative Boyd. He's my gumba so we can give each other a jab.

So I've heard a number of things
here. I realize that you pay taxes. I heard the
word "compromise." I heard the statement "shared
responsibility." Everybody should be a part of
this, public and private. And I've heard the terms
that we're in severe economic decline, which is the
one thing, Representative Killion, that nobody
plans for.

Prior to the economic decline, you know, things were looking pretty rosy. And we had a business model in 2007 totally unlike the business model that you have to have in 2010.

But as we look at each other in this -- in this beautiful room, we are the proverbial rats in the same ship that is sinking. And albeit the governor maybe should have started sooner, by the fact of the matter is, anybody in

this business knew that we were approaching the end of this program.

1.3

1.5

2.3

The question that I have is, what is your proposal? You've indicated that you're willing to compromise. You've indicated that you're willing to pay the portion of your exemption. The question is, how do we take that adultBasic and bring it to a practical plan so that it covers the basic things that people need and allow more people to get on it?

MS. KOCKLER: I would -- I would say, in terms of a proposal, I think we need to start with the number. We don't know what number we're trying to achieve. So as soon as we know what numbers, I mean dollars, how much money do we need from January 1st to June 30th, ostensibly, first of all, to get through this hole or gap, whatever you want to call it, that's caused by the agreement expiration itself? We are not clear on that.

And in the meantime, I think we do have the discussion about the program model. Can there be different levels of premium payments? Can there be a sliding scale premium? One person may still pay thirty-six, one person pays -- can you do that? Can you impose different levels of cost

sharing that brings down the premium?

1.3

2.3

You know, those are some of the things you can consider in the model itself, before you get to, you know, we're going to attach customers.

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: But that's exactly the point that I'm making. That's the discussion that needs to be happening immediately. What kind of proposals can be made by you? You're the experts. You deal with this every day. You know what each policy can provide. Your statistics indicate what the majority of the people, what services do they need. How do we change that model that Mr. Shapiro was talking about so that we can create some other options to give basic health care to people in Pennsylvania without breaking the bank? What do we have to do?

MR. BAKER: There's some other things that we believe need to be done. For one, change proposed in this legislation, would change it from a 60/40 program, where 60 percent goes into adultBasic and 40 percent is used for other activities, to 95 and 5, which would mean we would be in a situation where we would have to raise rates just to continue to underwrite programs like CHIP and so on, subsidize programs like CHIP and so

on and our public contributions.

1.3

1.5

2.3

So we would like to see it go back to the original 60/40. We believe that all of our -- all of the insurers, all health insurers in Pennsylvania should have participated in this. Our competitors, other than Independence, or -- excuse me -- Highmark, don't. And we believe they should have to be a part of this.

And we also believe that -- that it's important that the money that has been put into the program in the past from the tobacco settlement fund return to its original levels, the seventy-four million that they started with, and not reduced down to the fifteen million that is proposed this year.

Just last year, it was thirty-seven million, been cut from seventy-five down to thirty-seven over a period of years. Now they want to cut it down to fifteen and to redirect that money to another program. We understand the reason for it, but that's not acceptable in terms of trying to solve this problem.

 $\label{eq:representative pashinski: And that I} $$ appreciate very much.$ 

I wonder if it might be a possible

```
suggestion if we create a voluntary panel of people
1
2
     willing to sit down with the insurance companies
3
     and see whether or not we couldn't begin to devise
     some short-term and long-term solutions,
 4
     Mr. Chairman.
5
                   CHAIRMAN DELUCA: Pardon me?
 6
                   REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: I'd like to
7
     volunteer to be on an independent negotiations team
8
9
     to develop a new plan for the future of people in
10
     Pennsylvania.
11
                   CHAIRMAN DELUCA:
                                     We'll certainly
12
     discuss that.
1.3
                   REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Sound good?
14
                   CHAIRMAN DELUCA: Sounds good, but
15
     we'll certainly discuss that.
16
                   REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI:
                                              Thank you.
17
                   CHAIRMAN DELUCA: Representative Boyd.
                   REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: In the interest
18
19
     of time, Mr. Chairman, move on.
20
                   CHAIRMAN DELUCA: Anybody else, in the
     interest of time?
21
22
                   I've got a question, in that case.
                   REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI:
2.3
24
     Scott. You had your chance.
25
                   CHAIRMAN DELUCA: Representative
```

Barbin.

1.3

2.3

REPRESENTATIVE BARBIN: I have a question. Is it true that the amount that was required by all the Blues last year was a hundred seventy million, give or take, as your commitment to this agreement that you entered into voluntarily?

I know each of you paid different amounts, but was the total approximately a hundred seventy million dollars? Because your testimony today is that, for the next year, you're only willing to pay seventy-four million, and that the tobacco settlement funds need all come back.

My question, given Mr. Warfel's testimony that we're in a fragile economy, and the Chairman's statement that we have forty thousand people that are going to be pushed off the rolls, and Mr. Killion's statement and Mr. Pashinski's statement that we're in a fragile economy, how can you not continue this agreement for at least the 2011 year, regardless of what you negotiated before?

Because we're sitting, at the moment, where we're either going to come out of the recession or we're not. And if you take these

people off the rolls, and you throw them into the emergency room, the state, as a whole, as the economy is going to be a whole lot worse.

1.3

2.3

Now, there's a six-billion-dollar surplus that's spread out among all four of your companies, and all four of your company have a privilege in Pennsylvania to have a particular area, through your franchise agreements with the national group in Chicago. You have a privilege. And we don't tax that privilege.

Why shouldn't you continue this agreement for one year, in accordance with your social mission, so that whoever is the next governor and whatever that general assembly decides to do to share the appropriate burden among all insurers, among whoever, can be done without the threat of losing forty thousand people, who are going to have to run off to the emergency room? It just doesn't make sense.

It looks to me like you're the kid at the dam where the dam's about ready to flood, he's got his finger in the dam, and he says, Why don't we make an agreement to stay here for an hour?

Now, I'm taking this finger out the dam. The rest of you guys are in a lot of trouble.

Isn't that what you're saying, if you say you're only going to pay seventy-four million, because that was the deal?

1.3

2.3

MR. BAKER: Representative, according to the budget that was put out by the administration, if you look at expenditures for the 2009-'10 year, which, of course, has not yet ended, they estimate that the CHR portion will be a hundred almost thirteen million dollars, the tobacco portion will be approximately thirty-eight million, and there'll be an ending -- a balance in the account of about thirty-five million.

In respect to the rest of your question, I think the testimony we gave in terms of the taxes we pay already responds to that.

MR. CASHMAN: And, Representative, respectfully, I would submit, using your analogy, that six years ago, we were the people who saw the dam about to break, who willingly volunteered to stick our finger in it. And we looked around and we waited for one year, two year, three, and we kept our finger in the dam. We kept our finger in the dam, as our customers were being asked to pay more and more.

Our finger's still in the dam. All

we're saying today is, we're getting tired. It's not sustainable. We can't continue to do this.

1.3

1.5

2.3

We're, as always, willing to be at the table to discuss how we resolve that issue, but our fingers are getting tired, and we need some help.

REPRESENTATIVE BARBIN: Mr. Chairman, if I could just respond one second to that.

I read your testimony. You do more than any of the other groups through community health services to provide for those forty thousand like people. But I'm asking you, given the economy of the country, doesn't it make sense to hold your finger in there until the end of 2011, so that these people don't get pushed in the emergency room?

MS. KOCKLER: And, Representative, understand that the economy is, in the large part, why we're having the discussion, because when we do this, and if we sign up and extend or whatever, our customers that buy health insurance are going to pay for that. That is a whole 'nother -- those people are going to pay for this. We're not -- this isn't a pass-through. Someone is going to pay for it in their premium.

CHAIRMAN DELUCA: I'm going to -- I 1 2 know that we're on a tight time schedule. I hate 3 you cut you off, Representative. I want to thank each and every one of 4 you for your testimony and certainly your 5 willingness to work with us, and we look forward to 6 7 working with you. 8 MR. CASHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 9 10 CHAIRMAN DELUCA: Commissioner -- next 11 person to testify is Commissioner Ario. 12 Welcome. Good morning, Commissioner. 1.3 COMMISSIONER ARIO: Good morning, 14 Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. 1.5 For the record, my name is Joel Ario. 16 I'm the insurance commissioner for the state of 17 Pennsylvania. I will be brief in my comments so I 18 can answer some questions as well. 19 Let me start by saying, I'm not here 20 to bash the Blues. I have been consistently 21 impressed with all four Blue Cross/Blue Shield 22 organizations. In my three years here, they've 2.3 stepped up to a number of important challenges. 24 They're stepping up right now on the temporary 25 coverage under the federal law to get us to 2014.

They did step up on this programming burden. It's a deal that was made before I got here, but I think it was a very important deal, and it was made in 2005, and I hope we can have a continuation of some sort on that deal to continue to protect the adultBasics program.

1.3

I won't dwell on the history of that contract because it has been covered well by others. I'll make three general points. A, this program is still necessary. B, I think 2455 represents a reasonable approach to the problem.

I'll explain why. And then three, I think there is room to talk about alternatives on 2455 as well.

The program is still necessary. The majority leader spoke out eloquently on this issue, I think. When I came here, the program served something like fifty-five thousand people and had something less than a hundred thousand on the waiting list. Today, it serves somewhere in the low forties, so we will, I think, in any event, never get back to the number that was served when I got here only three years ago, which is fifty-five thousand, roughly. I think it got up as high as fifty-seven thousand. And certainly that waiting list that was under a hundred thousand is now four

hundred thousand, is testimony to the need for this program in the state.

1.3

2.3

hear from some, I think, community representatives who will tell you about that need, but I can tell you that every one of those four hundred thousand people on the waiting list translates to somebody who could tell a good story here about very specific, very important medical needs that they have and the way in which it haunts their life when they don't have the coverage. They make it vital -- absolutely vital that we find a solution to this problem.

I think 2455 is a reasonable approach. I heard -- I thought it was good dialogue that the committee had with the four Blue Cross/Blue Shield representatives today. I've worked with all of them, and I think they're fine people, and they're doing what they think is right here in terms of what they present. But I do think they're a bit selective in the paths that they give you.

First of all, the testimony suggests that it's a state of uncertainty in the federal reform. This is kind of more of a problem than a solution to them. If you look at the stock market

and what it's done to insurance companies since the federal reform passed, the stock market has indicated quite clearly, this is a good deal for insurance companies. And it's even a better deal for the nonprofit insurance companies, especially the Blue Cross/Blue Shield companies in this state and where they're situated.

1.3

1.5

2.3

Why? Because we're going to have thirty million new customers. What business in America has the federal government hand them thirty million new customers? And not just thirty million new customers, hundreds of billions of dollars a year in subsidies to those customers. That's going to be a million new customers in this state and billions of dollars of subsidies to pay the premiums that the insurers are going to charge.

This is a windfall. It is going to be a tremendous boon to the insurance industry. I mean, they have some obligations on that. Yes, they do. But they are going to prosper under those reforms. And particularly the Blue Cross/Blue Shield plans will, because they have the dominant share of the market in this state. So I'm just -- basically astonished that, the federal reform, as presented, they think it's a real threat and a

challenge. It's, in fact, a very important contributor. And it's why, by the way, the insurance industry was in strong support of this bill up until the very end.

1.3

2.3

There are a few things they don't like in the bill, yes, but on the whole and on the main, you see in the insurance industry, and I'll say, it's to their credit, since the reform passed, stepped up on a number of issues. They could have said that the children's pre-existing condition, didn't say guarantee issue, right now, so we're not giving guaranteed issue right now. But the presence of 26 didn't say kids coming off this year in college get it. This law doesn't take effect until September, so we're not going to give it to them.

The insurance companies have consistently stepped up, since the reform passed. Why? Because they do recognize the good deal here.

So that's -- I think that's the broadest context you bring to this issue as we're talking about getting from here to 2014, when things will get very, very good for the Blue Cross/Blue Shield plans in this state.

Secondly, there have been a number of economic setbacks for everybody in the last couple years. I'm not going to pretend that the economy didn't go in the ditch for the health insurers, just like it did for everybody else in 2007, 2008, and into 2009. But it went less in the ditch for the health insurers than almost anybody else.

1.3

2.3

You've heard kind of selective use of the facts about where revenues are. In fact, premium revenues are up, because the customers that have been lost and the number of people that have gone on uninsurance are more than made up for by rate increases on the people who stayed in the market for some of the reasons you suggest.

So every single one of these plans has more revenue, premium revenue, today than they had in 2005, and in most cases, considerably more.

Surplus, it was five billion aggregate in 2005. You heard one company, NEPA, testify to what its surplus had gone down from four hundred to two fifty. You didn't hear it from any of the other three. Why? Because their surpluses all went up since 2005. So six billion dollars in surplus.

I don't know if Representative

Schroder -- I guess he's still not here. I did say in front of the budget committee, that from a financial perspective, there's never too much surplus. My finance guys beat that into my head every day. There is never too much surplus. Things can always go wrong in the insurance business and they often do. And, so, there really is a desire, I think, from my financial guys, to always have that surplus bump up and up and up.

1.3

2.3

On the consumers' side, which is our other duty, people that run the adultBasic program, the CHIP program, the people that take consumer complaints, there's the desire to say, Let's keep that surplus as thin as we can, consistent with good principles, so that we can put probably more money, as Mike Warfel said, I think, back into the cheaper premiums.

So there's always a tension between those two concepts, but the six billion that they have in surplus is considerably more, proportionally, than any of the other charities have in this state. And there's a reason for that. Nonprofits have less access to capital, so they hold higher surpluses, but they hold considerably higher surpluses than any of the

for-profits in the state. And they also, on a RBC basis, are all comfortably above the minimum requirements. In, I think, all but one case, more than double the minimal requirement.

1.3

1.5

Does that mean that we have a lot of surplus to just go in there and take? No, we don't. We have to be very, very careful with that. But, again, five billion dollars when the deal was entered into, six billion dollars today.

So the overall story, from my perspective, is things took a little dive in the middle here, but basically these companies, compared to almost everybody else, have done quite well over the last five years, increased business, increased revenue, increased surplus, and looking at a bonanza, really a bonanza, I think, in 2014.

And again, I'm not saying it because I think it's bad. I was a strong supporter of that bill. I think we do want everybody in, and I think we want the private insurance companies serving those people, but it's going to be to their advantage.

So for those reasons, I think we ought to be somewhat skeptical to hear that there really isn't anyway we can find away to get from here to

2014.

1.3

2.3

was a lot of talk about how the deal was temporary in 2005, and everybody anticipated some other solution by 2010. I did not hear that from anybody when I came to the state, and that included some of the Blues. The story I heard was that the deal was to get us to reform.

And when I came, in 2007, everybody thought that was going to be Pennsylvania health reform. The governor denounced his plan, and there was a lot of fanfare and a lot of support for that plan at that time.

Health care, being as difficult as it is, that support eroded, and we didn't get the state plan. But that was the idea. This was a bridge to state reform. And if we were here today without the federal reform having passed, I would say we're in a world of hurt. A, we wouldn't have that windfall up the road for the Blue Cross plans. And, B, we would have, then, an endless kind of demand for something like adultBasic.

We did get the federal reform this year. So now we just have a little bit more bridge. And I think if anybody would have said, in

2005, We're making a five-year deal, but if, at the end of those five years, we've got a comprehensive solution that's going to cover all the people that are currently in adultBasic, either through Medicaid or through a new -- the new insurance exchanges, do we want to go off the cliff for a couple years before we get to that reform in 2014? I don't believe anybody would say yes. The plan is let's just go off the cliff for three years before we get to the reform.

1.3

2.3

So this is a plan to get us to the reform. So that's, I think, the reason why we should be here and why we should be engaged.

Now, are there other alternatives? I think that the Blues spoke well to the issue of whether we ought to ask whether other carriers should be involved in this program, and I heard a number of people on the committee support that. I think the governor said, in his budget address, that this could be a program for the Blues and for other insurers.

That's an open offer. We just haven't seen any proposals. And we've asked for proposals, but we just have not seen a good proposal. I think IBC did write a letter last week, which was

encouraging, starting to suggest a route forward, and we ought to engage that and we ought to look at the other insurers.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

But we ought not to get overly optimistic about that because, guess what, Blues do dominate the marketplace here such that we would -they have about two-thirds of the premiums. even if everybody was charged equally, and they got tax offsets -- oh, and that's another thing, there was a lot of talk about taxes. There's -- the Blues do pay a lot of taxes. And that's recognized This is an offset for every single dollar of tax paid. That's right in that bill. So that message, which I misspoke about in one hearing earlier this year and others have, has been heard loud and clear. There are tax offsets here. There would be for the for-profits.

By the time you were done taking the dominant premium rolls that the Blues have, and then bringing in the rest of the premiums, which may add -- you know, they have something like ten billion, maybe, in premium that would be accessible here, you may bring in another three billion or something, if you brought in everybody else. Then you have to add in the tax offsets, you're not

going to get a lot of money out of the rest of the insurers. But it's still an equitable point and it's a fair point to be raised.

1.3

1.5

2.3

And then I'd second the issues around, you know, doing everything we can to keep managing that benefit. This is a cut-throat business. I mean, the profit margins are not thick in this business. And the surplus is still, you know, compared to some other industries, not that big. So it's still a tough business, so it's constantly trying to revise those benefit plans and make them as effective as possible.

We did some work this year with cost sharing that was mentioned, to cut the benefit costs down 10 percent on the plan. We can continue to work on these sorts of things and try to get us through, but I think the bottom line is, we, as a state, need to find a solution here, and the bounty being primarily with the Blue Cross plans and Blue Shield plans, it's to their credit that they've got it. They've earned it. They deserve it. But they ought to continue to share and do the kinds of things they've done over the years.

And if we see that willingness, I believe we can solve this problem for the next few

```
vears.
1
2
                   Thank you, and I'd be happy to answer
3
     questions.
                   CHAIRMAN DELUCA: Very good,
 4
     Commissioner.
5
                   You mentioned, to your knowledge, was
6
7
     there -- when they entered into this agreement, why
     wasn't that a key part of their proposal, the five-
8
9
     year agreement, to have all the insurers
10
     participate at that time? It is a key component
11
     that they're proposing now.
12
                   COMMISSIONER ARIO: Mr. Chairman,
1.3
     having not been here and having not asked that
14
     particular question of the people who were party to
15
     the agreement as to why it wasn't, at that point --
16
                   CHAIRMAN DELUCA: I should have asked
17
     -- I appreciate that.
                   COMMISSIONER ARIO: -- I think I will
18
19
     have to beg off. But I would sheerly speculating,
20
     I really have not -- it's a very good question, I
21
     just haven't asked it of the people that were
22
     involved myself.
2.3
                   CHAIRMAN DELUCA:
                                     Thank you.
24
                   Representative Killion.
25
                   REPRESENTATIVE KILLION:
                                             Thank you.
```

I'm glad that the Blues are doing so well. I have an Inquirer article here, they posted a seventy-eight -- seventy-eight-million-dollar loss, and we know they're down nine hundred employees, but we can discuss that later.

1.5

2.3

Is it your opinion that if they continue the agreement at the current levels for all four Blues plans, that they would be able to do that without increasing premiums on businesses and families and not having to lay off employees? Do you believe they can do that?

unfortunately, the world we live in with health care, no one can get from here to 2014 without having to increase premiums. We've got a cost problem in the health care marketplace, where premiums double every ten years. Right now, that's why we're desperate. We need the reform.

So we're going to see premium increases, whether we do this plan or don't do this plan, between now and 2014 from all of the plans.

And, again, the use of the seventy-eight million and the nine hundred employees, if you look at these businesses, compare them to other businesses in the commonwealth, not over individual specifics,

like the results for a very short period of time but over the last five years, you will see that all of these companies, comparatively speaking -- we did go through a major crisis in the country -- but comparatively speaking, surplus, up; premium revenue, up; most indices of company health, up.

1.3

REPRESENTATIVE KILLION: There was a second component. Premium revenue may be up, but you also need to know what expenses -- where they're at as far as claims paid. And, you know, I can make a five-dollar hoagie and sell it for four dollars. I can make a lot -- it looks like I make a lot of money, but I'm actually losing money. So you need to consider that.

And also, you talked about this windfall, maybe it will be a windfall for all the insurers in the commonwealth. I don't know that. But I look at our hospitals, and you if went in and talked to any of our hospitals to see how well they're doing under the Medicaid plan, it's these guys that are bailing them out with their premiums to subsidize their losses. They're taking on the government — on the patients that are on the government plan.

So I -- and you're saying long term.

I hope we'll all be fine long term, but in the short term, where we are right now, they're hurting, and we are asking them to continue this. I think we all need to work together.

1.3

1.5

2.3

The conversations are about looking at the plans. You know, I had legislation last year for life plan. We ought to look at the benefit levels. We ought to look at the list of people on the waiting list. There are people on that waiting list that shouldn't even be here. They've gotten jobs, but we still count them on the waiting list.

I think we all need to work together on that, because we have the same goal. We want to keep the forty-thousand people that are currently on adultBasic on adultBasic. But I think it's unfair to just put all that, just telling the Blues, You're going to -- we're just going to force you to continue an agreement that you did voluntarily, now we're going to mandate that you do that agreement. We need to go beyond that.

COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative, again, I want to emphasize and underscore what you said at the end there, that there's a reasonable argument to look at everybody sharing the burden here and talking about that. I think it's

important. 1 On the other issue who's hurting and 2 3 who's not, I think when Joe Frick was here a couple years ago, he spoke to it well. He said, My mother 4 taught me never to complain about being hungry when 5 I have a loaf of bread under my -- in my arm. 6 7 comparatively speaking, again, all four Blues have bread under their arm. 8 9 CHAIRMAN DELUCA: Representative 10 Shapiro. 11 REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 12 And welcome, Commissioner. 1.3 14 Let me, before I get into my 15 questions, just commend you. You played an 16 incredibly important role in the national reform 17 debate. COMMISSIONER ARIO: As did you. 18 19 REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: Well, thanks. 20 You brought a lot expertise to the 21 table, and I know Pennsylvania's better off for it, 22 so thank you for your leadership there. 2.3 You, I think, answered most of my questions, so just sort of rapid fire, just want to 24

confirm. Again Representative Eachus testified

25

about a six billion -- presence of the six-billion-dollar surplus. You indicated that you concur with that number, that it is roughly six billion dollars.

1.3

2.3

COMMISSIONER ARIO: Slightly over six billion, correct.

REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: And then, in terms of the benefit package, I asked this question to Ms. Kockler about whether or not we're building this program on a foundation that's faulty, and the response from her and the other panelists was that perhaps, in some cases, the benefits are too rich, and we need to relook at that.

You seemed open to that idea in your testimony. But I don't want to put words in your mouth. Can you just maybe address that line of questions she and I had earlier?

with the caveat that we did just go through an excruciating set of discussions with each of the adultBasic participants on cutting 10 percent on premium by increasing cost sharing and putting some caps on the number of visits and so forth, we just did that this year, and so I kind of shudder a little bit about trying to do more. But, yes,

we're always open to those kinds of ideas, if there are good suggestions that way.

1.3

1.5

2.3

REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: And then the last question, as it relates to the for-profit insurers, you had stated we want private insurers serving those people, and I just want to make sure I understood correctly that you believe they should have some skin in the game on this as well, in terms of putting some dollars forth, recognizing the financial situations that they're in. Do I have that correct, in terms of your view on that?

yes, you do. To get thirty million new customers, I think, does involve some skin in the game on the part of the industry. And we've seen it, frankly. They've got a lot of skin in the game. And you've talked about some new taxes and so forth.

REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: You'd be amenable to an amendment to this legislation, perhaps, or some other bill, that requires them to pay up alongside the Blues in order to sustain adultBasic for some period of time?

COMMISSIONER ARIO: Again, if you go back to the governor's budget address, it included language about the Blues and other insurers, and I

think that still stands, and we're still open to 1 2 that. I mean, I know that's still open. 3 REPRESENTATIVE SHAPIRO: Thank you for your testimony. I concur particularly with that 4 5 latter point a thousand percent. Thank you. 6 7 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 8 CHAIRMAN DELUCA: Representative Boyd. 9 REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: Thank you, 10 Mr. Chairman. 11 Commissioner, couple of real quick 12 questions. 1.3 One, the governor's budget proposed to 14 take more money from the tobacco settlement funds 15 that was clearly intended, from day one, to be 16 driven into adultBasic. We heard testimony 17 dropping that number from roughly seventy-four 18 million dollars, now, in his current budget, to 19 fifteen. Do you think that's an appropriate 20 proposal? 21 COMMISSIONER ARIO: Representative, 22 again, not being here back then, I can't speak to 2.3 the clearly intended part of your question. that money is going is to the medical assistance 24 25 for disabled workers, which is an entitlement

program under the Medicaid allotment, and so we have to provide that support to that program under Medicaid obligation.

1.3

2.3

So were we to take money from that pot, we would then have to find a replacement for that, so it would be a bit of a shell game. So it's in that context, I think, that you end up with the diminishing revenue to this program, and it clearly does create more stress on this program, but I don't see a good alternative, short of another funding source for the disabled worker program.

REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: In my eight years, I can agree with you that budget processes are shell games, but we'll go on from there.

I would like if you could give me a real short answer to the real question, the fundamental policy question that Mr. Warfel directed. If, in fact, there's Blues reserves, those Blues reserves have come from premiums that have been paid primarily by private sector insurance plans.

Do you believe those reserves are fundamentally -- should be driven back in premium discounts, or do you believe that it's a better

policy decision for the state to take them for other purposes, like funding adultBasic? It's a fundamental policy question.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

COMMISSIONER ARIO: I tend -- it's a very good, astute question, and you can argue both sides of it. I could argue on both sides of it. tend to think the stronger side of that argument is that when we create these large entities and they're nonprofits of the state, that the broader populous has some claim on that money in addition to the specific ratepayers. In there, they basically get paid a fair rate as they were set in the market during the years that they paid them. And to say that, you know, those claims go -- those ratepayers get those claims would be the same thing to me, kind of the same, that, you know, the shareholders are betting on who raked in some of the money that Aetna collected from its ratepayers owe that money back in some form or fashion to the ratepayers, if there were to be some sort of action like that.

I think it's -- people pay fair rates, and, in general, that money can be looked at as a -- put it this way, if the Blues were to convert to for-profit at some point, as has happened in

other states, there would be -- if it works like other states -- we don't even have a law on this yet in this state, but if we did and it worked like it did in other states, there would be a public claim on those dollars and a public contribution and benefit that were gained through the nonprofit.

1.3

And it's more than just a nonprofit thing, by the way. It's a combination of things that work there would go into some kind of public foundation. So, in that respect, I lean on the public side of that.

move forward, perhaps, Mr. Chairman, with, you know, some -- with some looking at this overall program, what we end up doing to preserve the adultBasic program, perhaps that would be something that would be a good part of the policy discussion that may be -- because I think everybody's testified that, no matter what, premiums are going up. I mean, that's -- you said that a couple times.

And my comment is, that's a problem, because, currently, the private sector is to the point where they cannot continue to afford to pay

for health premiums, so if they're going to continue to go up, maybe a part of the component to this could be 50/50, maybe it would split half the revenue, if there is a surplus in reserve, half that would go to adultBasic, and maybe some could be driven back for premium reduction. But we'll -- that's something that we can at least talk about.

1.3

1.5

And then my last question is, one of the things that I have some concern about is I've been provided some information that the department has actually gone out and sent letters to more people to invite them to get onto the adultBasic rolls. And I know periodically the governor, historically, would do press releases and say, you know, We've opened to sixteen thousand new people.

My -- the information I was provided is, is that a similar option was offered recently in this first quarter of 2010 for forty-some-odd thousand people. Is that correct? And given the current stress on the system and the fact that we're in, perhaps not crisis mode yet, but in a very serious situation, why would we be offering for more people to get onto that program when we're not sure we have a funding mechanism for it in the future?

again. In the response to several legislators who have seen us make these bulk offers periodically over time, people have said, Why don't you just make a monthly offer to keep moving people in and out of the program in a more periodic basis? And so we took that to heart and changed the program so that we would make monthly offers. And we've been doing that this year. We've been making monthly offers.

1.3

2.3

The governor said in his budget address that he thought the program should be at kind of a historic midpoint, which would be about fifty thousand. Remember, it was as high as fifty-seven. Because of all the budget issues last year, they dropped down to forty. So our instruction was basically to make larger monthly offers in order to build the program back towards fifty. That's what we've been doing.

I think we're -- right now, today, if we just took a snapshot, we probably haven't achieved that full fifty thousand. If everything runs through the system, with the current offers, we'd probably be up in the forty-six, forty-seven, forty-eight, somewhere in there, range. So we have

increased the program some.

1.3

1.5

2.3

We're now on maintenance offers each month, and just making an offer enough to keep the program level. If it was the will of the legislature and the governor to say, We want the program to go back down smaller -- we do lose about five hundred people a month to illness, whatever, can't afford even the small premiums, so you can manage the number down over time. You can manage it up over time.

But that's the way in which it was based -- and the governor was quite public about saying that the target was the fifty thousand. And lately we've heard of lot of talk about why we were doing that, and that's a valid issue to have in the legislature, but it came from a public announcement that that's what we were going to do.

 $\label{eq:REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: Thank you,} % \end{substitute} % \end$ 

CHAIRMAN DELUCA: Thank you.

I just want to bring to your attention, and we're in the midst of trying to get some -- get some information, as Representative Boyd talks about employers and cost of health care, CNN did a story last week, and I don't know if

you're familiar with that CNN statement about 1 2 health care in Pennsylvania and other states. 3 COMMISSIONER ARIO: I only watch Fox 4 so --5 CHAIRMAN DELUCA: Well, let me say this -- that's why you only watch Fox --6 7 COMMISSIONER ARIO: Fair and balanced. CHAIRMAN DELUCA: Good. Fair and 8 balanced. 9 10 What I find astonishing was the fact 11 that we were singled out as one of the highest cost 12 for hospital and profit margins, a hundred forty-1.3 one percent, compared to Maryland at 31 percent, 14 and we're trying to ascertain how they got the 15 figures, because I find that outrageous. New 16 York's higher than that, than the national average. 17 We're higher than the national average providing 18 funds for our hospitals and that there, which has an impact on the insurers, which certainly -- we 19 20 will be sending them a letter to find out why the cost is so high in Pennsylvania compared to other 21 22 And that's a horrific figure, a hundred 2.3 forty-one percent profit margin for a hospital. COMMISSIONER ARIO: Mr. Chairman, I 24 25 think what you'll find in the hospitals here, as we

find and compare to Oregon and compared to what I know about other states, is we have a more pronounced kind of tale of rich and poor in this state than most states. So you take some of the large urban hospitals, they do quite well in the state, probably significantly better than the average across the country. Then you go into some of the rural parts of the state, and we have some of the really tough situations as well.

1.3

1.5

2.3

Now, every state has some of that kind of thing. I think it's more pronounced in this state.

CHAIRMAN DELUCA: But it was -- you know, it was eye opening to find out that we were singled out on the CNN health care news report.

Thank you. And thank you. We look forward to working with you, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER ARIO: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DELUCA: Last panel we have, and then we certainly apologize to them for the time, but we thank them for coming, and that's Sharon Ward, director of Pennsylvania Budget and Policy Center; Richard Weishaupt, senior counsel of Community Legal Service; and Kim Ward, consumer, adultBasic waiting list.

Welcome. Thank you for taking the time to come out here this morning, and even though we're a little late for you, we thank you for staying in there.

1.3

2.3

Who would like to start off?

MS. WARD: Good morning. Thank you,

Chairman DeLuca and Chairman Micozzie and members

of the committee, for inviting us here today and

for having a panel of consumers.

I do want to say that our third panelist, whose name is Kelly Amos, actually -- that was the wrong name on the agenda -- had a doctor's appointment and she had to leave.

In the interest of time, what I think I'm going to do is to not read my testimony, but I just want to hit upon some key points. And what I want to do is to draw you back to remind the committee about why we have this program in the first place.

So I do want to thank you for inviting us here today, and here with the Pennsylvania
Budget and Policy Center. We're also a participating member of the Pennsylvania Health Access Network, and there are about fifteen people from around the state from a group who are here

today.

1.3

1.5

2.3

We have adultBasic because of affordable health insurance has been very difficult to find for many Pennsylvanians. Premium costs have increased well in excess of inflation and wages, as you well know. But Pennsylvania has been particularly acute.

Pennsylvania ranked second nationally in that largest number of people who have lost employment-based coverage. Almost seven hundred thousand people have lost employment-based coverage in Pennsylvania during the last decade. We're second only to Michigan. We're well above California. We're well above New York. We have a particularly bad problem here in Pennsylvania.

According to the Department of Insurance, 8.2 percent of residents, about one million, including eight hundred eighty thousand working age people, have no health insurance. And that was in 2008. We expect that number is going to increase significantly because of the recession.

One of the issues that came up today was around the issue of adultBasic and the Community Health Reinvestment Agreements and what

taken to try to address this previously. Well, I want to say that this general assembly has entertained, for at least two years, administrative proposals to address the growing number of uninsured in Pennsylvania. That was through the Cover All Pennsylvanians proposal, the access to bear proposal that Representative Eachus introduced last year.

1.3

2.3

Those programs would have both improved the benefits, because the adultBasic package, unlike what you've heard here today, is not a rich benefit package. It does not include prescription drugs. It does not include behavioral health coverage. In fact, those changes would have needed to have been made for the adultBasic program to become federalized.

A plan had been enacted in 2007 to provide stable state funding and to draw down federal Medicaid funds for adultBasic, in 2007, and have been proposed. We would have brought in a number — depending on how much Pennsylvania would have put in, hundreds of million of dollars in additional federal funds. We would have been able to stabilized the program. We would have been able

to serve more people.

1.3

1.5

2.3

So we are not asking for an expansion. We're not asking for you to take any additional steps to cover more people. We're simply asking you to take the steps to keep the people who desperately need coverage covered today.

I also want to address another issue that comes up a lot. Two things. First, the lack of health insurance coverage is as much a rural problem as an urban one. There's always a myth that all the uninsured people live in cities. That's not the case.

According to, again, the Department of Insurance survey, residents of the northeast and north central region have the highest proportions of uninsurance, well above the state average.

Twenty percent or more of the residents of Union,
McKean, and Bedford County were uninsured in 2008,
and 17 percent of the residents of Potter, Wayne,
and Susquehanna Counties, and the same share of the population is uninsured in Jefferson and Venango
Counties as in Philadelphia County.

The other thing you need to realize that adultBasic is a well-established program. The mechanics are there. We want to keep it in place.

It serves about forty thousand in Pennsylvania who are enrolled this -- in April of this year, and they range across the state.

1.3

1.5

We have a map, which I probably didn't share with you, that shows the enrollment of adultBasic and the waiting list as of March. And there are people enrolled in every county in Pennsylvania.

And although the program enrolls only a small percentage of the total population of working age adults, about half a percent statewide, it's more than that, double that, in eleven counties, including Bedford, Potter, Somerset, Clearfield, Susquehanna, Sullivan, Tioga, some of our most rural counties.

AdultBasic is the insurance source for people who don't qualify for other public programs and they can't afford health insurance on their own. This includes childless adults without a disability -- they're not eligible for medical assistance -- and working parents, once they get a job and their income is 25 percent of the federal poverty level. It's also the only program that exists for people between a hundred and 200 percent of the federal poverty level, and that is the group

who's most likely to be uninsured.

1.3

1.5

2.3

We can give you numbers and statistics, but to understand who doesn't have health insurance in Pennsylvania and who is served by this program, I'd ask you to take a look at the people who are caring for our parents and caring for our children. Look at the people who are at the Sheetz every day, giving us our coffee.

These are people who are stuck in the middle. They toil away at jobs that don't pay enough to give them the opportunity to afford insurance or their employers aren't offering insurance at all. And many of them have preexisting conditions.

And as we sought to recover stories from people who are on adultBasic or on the adultBasic waiting list, these are people who have been excluded by our health insurance companies because of our terrible consumer protections in our regulatory system. They have pre-existing conditions, and their only option has been to purchase insurance on an individual market, which is very, very expensive.

Let me draw your attention to the attachment two on my testimony. There are a number

of stories there that I thought we should share.

Of course, I need to find them myself now. But let

me -- let me address Marry Hollis, who's a

certified nurse and midwife in Brookville,

Pennsylvania, who applied for adultBasic and spent

two years on the wasting list, and who claims that

7 the program saved her life, not once but many

8 times.

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

She was -- she has numerous health problems. The cheapest insurance she could find was five hundred dollars per month, and she claims that when she called around to find individual insurance, she was hung up on by insurance agents, after mentioning that she had a preexisting condition.

Well, she's an individual. She's not a charity, but she has taken her access to a public program and turns that to a public benefit. She started a free clinic to give care to pregnant women and teenagers on a sliding scale. And she says, Please, help us who fall through the cracks.

Kathy Dabanian, from Sellersville,
Pennsylvania, has been diagnosed with Lyme disease
and almost died, and adultBasic saved her.

And, again, we have heard this over

25

and over again, that people got on the adultBasic program, and their lives were saved because they had access to care that enabled them -- their clinicians to diagnosis problems that were severe and they were able to be treated.

1.3

1.5

2.3

Finally, we have Viola Scheurer. Her story come to us from out of the clinical director of health center number ten in Philadelphia. She had a small amount of blood in her urine, and when -- she was able, because of her insurance coverage, to get an exam that showed at presence of a large tumor in the bladder that was cancerous. Again, another person who was saved by this program.

So I would urge you to do everything that you can to save it and to ensure that we continue this coverage. Again, the federal health care reform will kick in in January 2014. There will be expanded opportunities for the medical assistance program, which the federal government will pay 100 percent for, for the first four years.

There will be health insurance exchanges for individuals and small businesses to find insurance where there is competition, real

competition among insurers. This system has worked in Massachusetts. The number of people that have — that are uninsured has gone down dramatically, and the number of businesses buying insurance has gone up. So we've got to get from here to there.

1.3

2.3

So let me take -- let me take just a couple of minutes to talk a little bit about the Community Health Reinvestment Agreement. What we've heard over and over again was an attempt to link Community Health Reinvestment Agreement to the adultBasic program, and I want to tell you that is a false link. That is not how we got here today.

Agreements were -- were negotiated in response to what was a five-year public outcry over the large surpluses that were amassed by the nonprofit Blues. That was not just an issue here in Pennsylvania, that occurred across the country. And with -- with their surpluses, many of the nonprofit Blues decided they were going to take their money and run and move to -- and fully convert to for-profits. They needed legislative approval to do that or insurance department approval to do that.

In many states, there was an effort to -- it created a dialogue about what's private and what's public and how much is owed to the public because of the nonprofit status that was given to these organizations, the statute here in Pennsylvania. What -- how much of that was benefit that was owed to the public?

1.3

2.3

In California, they took the assets and they converted them to a private foundation. And in New York and Wisconsin, they took the assets and the state used that money to provide health insurance. It was considered widely to be public benefit that should have been collected and accrued to -- for public uses.

The nonprofit conversion stopped, in part, because they were no longer allowed, many insurance departments decided to oppose them, and perhaps that wasn't exactly the approach that the nonprofit Blues found most advantageous to them.

But here in Pennsylvania, there was a class action suit filed against all four Blue Cross plans by small employers, complaining about the size of the surpluses. In 2003, the insurance department, under pressure from large and small employers about those surpluses, began to deny rate

increases for the Blues.

1.3

1.5

2.3

And after that, the Community Health
Reinvestment Agreements began to be negotiated.

There were a lot of other steps into between, but
let me just point you to another chronology.

Actually, it wasn't -- well into 2004 that anybody
talked about recapturing some of the Blues surplus
money for adultBasic. That was not of the
conversation prior to that.

And in 2005, the governor announced the signing of the agreement, the Community Health Reinvestment. And two days later, the insurance commissioner released a determination by the Pennsylvania insurance department that the plans did not have excess surpluses. Two days later.

Shortly after that, two or three months after that, the insurance department began reviewing and approving the Blues rate hikes.

So this has been, from the beginning, about -- and its a dialogue that needs to continue -- about what the appropriate rate of surplus is, who do they belong to.

I agree with Commissioner Ario that there is a strong history, because of the constitutional and statutory preference that is

given to the nonprofit Blues, to have some of that captured for public use. But, certainly, as a nonprofit and small business, we all pay. We pay very high insurance premiums. And, certainly, a balance needs to be reached about the appropriate level of those surpluses.

1.3

2.3

So before I leave, let me just say two things. There's precedent in Pennsylvania for a premium assessment on nonprofit Blues. The first one was -- was assessed as part of the agreement on the merger in 1996 that created Highmark. There was a 1.2 percent assessment on the premiums that was part of that merger approval.

And then, the other thing I want to do is, if you look at the third attachment of my testimony, what I have for you is some information on the Blues businesses. And I urge you to take a look at that. And I will look at it myself, if I could find it. But let me -- I'm trying to rush through here.

There is an underlying issue of surpluses. The Blue Cross providers are large, complex, and they're profitable. Attachment three, look at the profit and surplus information for IBC and Highmark for 2004 to 2007. Again, we're not

being selective here. That's all the information that we have happen to have collected at that time, and it was while the merger discussions were going on.

1.3

1.5

2.3

They're very complex companies.

Independence Blue Cross has thirty-five affiliated companies in three states. Their nonprofit business is a very small share of that consolidated company. Sixteen million of a hundred seventy-two million dollars book of business. Their net income per member per month was fourteen dollars and sixty-five cents, and they had 1.5 billion in retained earnings on the nonprofit side and 1.7 billion in the consolidated company.

have forty-two subsidiaries in several states, and they do a greater share of business through their nonprofit. Their net income per member was much -- was lower than Independence Blue Cross. It actually grew substantially in 2007. The retained earnings on the nonprofit side were 3.5 billion dollars and 3.9 billion dollars for the consolidated company.

There's -- some have argued that we've had a for-profit conversion in Pennsylvania by

fiat, essentially, that the Blues have moved more of their business into the for-profit side.

Certainly they were encouraged to do that on the Medicaid managed care side because it enabled them then to assess -- enabled assessments to be levied that helped to draw down additional federal

1.3

1.5

2.3

Medicaid dollars.

Commissioner Ario was right. The insurance companies are -- stand to benefit tremendously from federal health care reform. They have almost 70 percent of the business here in Pennsylvania.

You did not see Harry and Louise in this year's federal health care reform debate because the insurance companies were supporting the federal health care reform because it is expanding their customer base.

Much of the new business will be from younger and healthier individuals. They're going to be less costly. And the new rules around restricting rating, restricting exclusions based on preexisting conditions are actually going to affect the for-profits more than -- the private insurers more than the Blues and so they should benefit substantially.

But why do we want to do this? Why should we do this at all? Health insurance coverage reduces health care costs, provides stable funding for health clinics and hospitals and it saves lives.

We urge you to find the way not to have a temporary extension of this. Don't let the program just attrit into oblivion, which is what we fear if enrollment stops. But we urge you now, while you can -- and we have great trust in your judgment here -- find a solution that will enable these individuals to maintain their health insurance. Don't make the problem worse this year.

Thank you.

MR. WEISHAUPT: Thank you,

17 Mr. Chairman.

1.3

1.5

2.3

I, too, will depart from my written comments. I'm sure you can read them yourself.

I just want to say a few things and address some of the questions that various members of the committee have had.

One question was, well, what is exactly the nature of your -- of the Blues' nonprofit status. They're actually considered --

this a quote from an old law -- institutions of purely public charity, which gives them limited tax exemptions. And, by the way, gives them tax exemptions for localities.

1.3

2.3

Now, some localities do charge payments in lieu of taxes, but it's not completely clear that those payments were actually the same as what would be charged to for-profit entities.

Now, in order to qualify as a purely public charity, an institution must do several things. They must have a charitable purpose. They must render substantial portions of their services for free or greatly reduced subsidized prices and relieve the government of some of its burdens.

That's exactly what the CHR did. The CHR came about as a result not of a purely voluntary move by the Blues, although we applaud them for signing the agreement, but there were a number of challenges, including the challenge brought by fourteen groups, including labor unions and Sharon's organization and alliances of senior citizens, among others, claiming that the Blues were — were amassing surpluses that were too great.

And although it is very understandable

that an executive of a Blue would say there is no surplus that is too great, that, in fact, is not true. While a surplus of ever increasing size is good if you want to dominate the market and inhabit the entry of others into the market, it does make sense and — to have a limit on surplus, and that's what the Insurance Department has done. That's what the National Association of Insurance Commissioners recommends. And that's what the Blue Cross national organization requires of its members.

1.3

1.5

2.3

We filed a proceeding, among other people, before the insurance commission in 2004, claiming that the surpluses had grown too large. The commissioners — the then-commissioner of insurance, who was a holdover from the previous administration, held hearings and actually hired experts to investigate the question.

At a point where it was in doubt as to which way things were going to go as to the size of the surplus, the administration struck a deal with the Blues where they would sign a CHR that would devote 60 percent of their obligation to provide charitable activities to adultBasic as a way to prop up the adultBasic system.

1 They freely signed that agreement.

1.3

1.5

2.3

That agreement was timed and when the administration ended. It wasn't like they just picked a date out of a hat and didn't know when that -- when that would end. It was done on purpose then, in order to see whether they could renegotiate a better deal, frankly, with the new administration.

We're now at that point. We have nothing against negotiations, although we think consumers should be at the table when the legislature and the Blues are discussing that, and we can look at things like, where is the charitable money that the Blues spend every year, where does it go, and which are the highest priorities.

There's always a temptation to spend that money in ways that looks more like public relations than like the highest priorities. Right now the highest priority in Pennsylvania should be providing insurance to people for the three years before we get to the implementation of the health care reform act.

There are 1.4 million people in Pennsylvania that are uninsured. Almost four hundred thousand of them have signed up for

adultBasic. That's 27 percent of all the insured think that the only way that they can get insurance is to sign up on the waiting list.

1.3

1.5

2.3

When they get to the head of the line, they're screened to make sure that they haven't got any other type of insurance. They're screened to make sure that they meet the income requirements. Those income requirements are -- have some bite. There are people who are limited to less than 200 percent of the federal poverty level and a number that often gets bandied about, but people may not know what it means. That means that their household income for a couple is twenty-four hundred a month, and for an individual, it's eighteen hundred dollars a month.

So these are not folks that can afford a drastic rewriting of their insurance policy. The insurance policy basically covers limited -- right now, it covers limited number of hospital -- I'm sorry -- limited number of doctor visits and hospitalization.

If you have eighteen hundred dollars in monthly income, you can't afford thousands of dollars in co-pays or -- like some plans have gone to, a six-thousand-dollar deductible. That would

mean that they would have no other income for six months or -- I'm sorry -- for three months.

1.3

So, although it may be something that needs to --that a better look needs to be taken to, there's not a huge amount of money to be obtained by looking at the subscribers and saying, Okay, you pay more.

The interesting thing about the folks that are on adultBasic, when you look at it, is 60 odd percent of them are working. They're working right now, but their employer does not provide any kind of employer-based health insurance.

Another significant percentage of them are people who become disabled but cannot work. They're getting Social Security, but Social Security has a two-year waiting period for Medicare to kick in. So there are people that worked in the past, something happened to them, maybe they had an accident at work, maybe they just got old, maybe the toll of working at a -- at a, you know, at a heavy job was just too much. They get to be in their late fifties. They need to wait two years before they can qualify for Medicare. And they have no other place to pay their health care bills. So they're also at least previous workers.

They're also people who have taken early retirement. Certainly, there's been a disproportion of people over sixty who've been laid off. Medicare doesn't start until you get to be sixty-five. They have taken the early retirement at sixty-two or sixty-three, traded in a lower monthly amount, because they needed it to live on. And they all are people, the people, your constituents, who qualify for adultBasic.

1.3

These are not wealthy people. These are not people with a lot of extra in their pockets to pay for co-pays and deductibles.

The other thing I would mention, as Sharon did, this does not pay for drugs at all.

There's no drug coverage whatsoever. And there is no behavioral health coverage at all. It's basically doctor visits and hospital care. That's it.

In summary, what we would say is, like Commissioner Ario, we need a bridge to get from 2011 to 2014. In -- I don't know, windfall might be too harsh a word, but certainly the changes that are going to come about as a result of health care reform are only going to benefit insurance companies.

Now, that -- in a way, that's good, because then basically a very high percentage of people will have insurance in our commonwealth.

But, right now, we need to get from here to there.

1.3

2.3

And the costs are not just the visible ones. Two things. Representative Barber (sic), I think, pointed out that if you take away insurance from these folks, they're still going to get sick. They're still going to go to emergency rooms. They're going to create costs for the hospitals in your communities, for the hospitals in my communities. They're going to create upward pressure on premiums, because hospitals are going to say, Look, we've had a huge increase in uncompensated care. We are going to go out of business, and we're not going to be able to serve your insured if we don't find a way to pay for this uncompensated care.

That's going to happen. There is no doubt about that. It's not easy to put a number on that, but that's undoubtedly true.

The other thing that's going to happen is there's going to be upward pressure on other Pennsylvania programs. Medicaid has a spend-down level, that if you basically become totally

destitute, you can qualified for Medicaid. Nobody wants to see that happen. Those levels are down in the 40 or 50 percent of the poverty level.

1.3

1.5

2.3

But the fact of the matter is, if people become totally destitute and run up huge bills in the hospital, they're going to turn to Medicaid, and then we're going to have to insure them under the Medicaid program. And so, once again, it's going to come directly out of the -- out of the treasury.

People will also look to health clinics and other places that are funded with public revenue, all of which are good, we applaud that, but those are consequences that are not without costs. Who knows how many people will not get better as a result of the care that they have got on adultBasic and return to work.

A lot of -- as Commissioner Ario pointed out, this is not like a stagnant pool of people. People come in that door and they leave through that door. One of the main reasons that they leave is they get a job with health insurance. Hopefully, adultBasic can make -- can restore them to health so they can get that job and so they don't become burdens on other programs.

So we realize that this is a challenge, but that is why you're there. And we applaud you for taking up that challenge, and we think that adultBasic is a program that the commonwealth and the people in it vitally need, and we'll do anything within our power to assist you in getting to a solution that preserves adultBasic, not just for six months but until 2014.

Thank you.

1.3

2.3

CHAIRMAN DELUCA: Very good. I want to thank you for your presentation, both. It was very enlightening. And we look forward to working with you.

Let me ask you this: Have you, what process are you going to be doing, as consumers' groups, to notify the individuals of this crisis that are on the waiting list? Are you doing anything?

MR. WEISHAUPT: Well, PHAN,

Pennsylvania Health care Access Now has already put

stuff up on its website, explaining to people what

the problems are and asking them to talk to their

legislators about the future of the program.

We're not in a position right now where we want to scare people into thinking that

```
it's a done deal that their health care is going to
1
2
     end, but certainly we are advising them of the
3
     precarious nature of the program right now and that
     both they need to perhaps become more active in
 4
5
     seeking a solution and also thinking about the
     future.
6
7
                   CHAIRMAN DELUCA: So you think it'd be
     appropriate to wait until maybe November to scare
8
     them?
9
10
                  MR. WEISHAUPT: Well, we're telling
11
     them now, and I think a lot of them --
12
                   CHAIRMAN DELUCA: I mean, you know
1.3
     what I'm trying to say? You maybe don't think it's
     a crisis. It's a crisis right now, whether you
14
1.5
     think it or not.
16
                  MR. WEISHAUPT: It's a slow-moving
17
     crisis.
                   CHAIRMAN DELUCA: Well, I don't know
18
19
     about slow-moving. December comes. You know --
20
     you know, what happens is, time moves. And it is a
21
     crisis, whether you -- and I think you have an
22
     obligation to notify these people there is a
2.3
     crisis.
24
                   The other thing I would suggest that
25
     you do, as a consumer group, is that we have a lot
```

of town meetings out there that the gubernatorial candidates on both sides have been going to, and I hadn't heard one address the adultBasic crisis. So you might have some of your people who are on adultBasic want to know what they intend to do if they become elected governor, because --

1.3

1.5

2.3

MR. WEISHAUPT: That's a very good suggestion.

I say that, under the Obama administration, we heard about change. And we know about change. Outside now, all the gubernatorial candidates is reform. Now, we understand Harrisburg needs to be reformed, but we also understand that we got a billion dollar -- almost a billion-dollar deficit, and we want to know what cuts are going to be made from these candidates, not just reform. And I haven't heard that yet.

And I think it behooves the consumer groups to start asking questions on this type of program, the benefits. When we throw forty thousand dollars -- forty thousand individuals off on the health care, that's a crisis. Consumer groups have an obligation to alert their members.

MS. WARD: Mr. Chairman, we certainly

agree with that, and we have been notifying -we've been putting information out about this, but,
I think, if you're suggesting -- in some of the
questions suggested when is it appropriate for the
health insurance companies to notify people that
the funding for the program may be coming to an
end, I would agree with you sooner rather than
later. Thirty days is not appropriate.

1.3

1.5

2.3

CHAIRMAN DELUCA: We are going to notify the administration of the fact that is to get that --- if it's a thirty-day window, that is not acceptable.

Again, I want to thank you for your testimony.

I want to thank everyone for their very excellent presentations we received today. They will be very helpful to the committee in its considerations of this and any other legislation that addresses the issue of funding for adultBasic program.

As always, my thanks to the committee members for their attendance today and a lot of them had to go to the house floor.

Let me also note for you that we will have a committee meeting scheduled for the 26th,

and at that meeting will be voting session. Lastly, I will note that we have scheduled a public hearing on the commonwealth implementation of the new federal health care reform bill for the 27th, to educate ourselves and educate the members on the national health care legislation. Again, I want to thank you. this meeting is now adjourned. Thank you very much. (Whereupon, the hearing concluded at 11:45 a.m.) 

1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
2	I HEREBY CERTIFY that I was
3	present upon the hearing of the above-entitled
4	matter and there reported stenographically the
5	proceedings had and the testimony produced;
6	and I further certify that the foregoing is a
7	true and correct transcript of my said
8	stenographic notes.
9	
10	BRENDA J. PARDUN, RPR
11	Court Reporter  Notary Public
12	Nocary rabire
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	