

Summary of Comments on Financial Sustainability Draft Report

Working Group Chair –report is consistent with Working Group’s thoughts and is good policy.

Consumer #1– tax tobacco, alcohol, sugar, salt

Consumer #2 - Health care reform will not work

Consumer #3 – tax internet sales and gasoline

Consumer #4:

- Need a mechanism to control costs
- Income stratification may result in higher and middle income wage earners to choose high deductible plans, thereby decreasing premiums available for sustainability
- Broaden the base of participating insurers (i.e. get rid of the \$50,000 threshold)
- Add excess revenues from traffic cameras and parking enforcement

Dental Carrier:

1. Purpose of assessment is to fund exchange but because all medical plans offer pediatric dental, they cannot offer standalone pediatric dental in OR out of the exchange.
2. Oppose assessment on QDPs outside of the exchange. Fees outside of exchange will make prices higher since they do not have the benefit of exchange marketing or facilitation.

Health Carrier: unclear if assessment applies to HIPAA excepted benefits. Opposes HIPAA excepted benefits being subject to assessment.

Text of Comments

From: Leighton Ku [mailto:lku@gwu.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2013 2:42 PM
To: Comments, FSR (DCHBX)
Subject: Comments on financial sustainability report

As chair of the working group on this issue and a Board member, I think the draft report reflects our decision and is a reasonable and fair policy for the District. It is implicit in the report that the group -- which included a wide variety of members including representatives of insurers and advocates -- unanimously agreed to the working group report in order to obtain complete consensus.

Leighton Ku, PhD, MPH
Professor, Dept. of Health Policy
Director, Center for Health Policy Research
School of Public Health and Health Services
George Washington University
2021 K St., NW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20006
phone 202-994-4143
fax 202-994-3996

From: Wes Rivers [mailto:rivers@dcfpi.org]
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 9:25 AM
To: Curtis, Debra (DCHBX)
Subject: RE: Draft Financial Sustainability Report

Hey Debbie,

Just wanted you to know that I reviewed the document and we will not be submitting any extra comments. Very nice work.

-Wes

From: Mariele777@aol.com [mailto:Mariele777@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2013 9:56 PM
To: Comments, FSR (DCHBX)
Subject: Comments on Draft Financial Sustainability Report

As a District resident, who works independently and has been purchasing medical insurance for many years, I would like to thank the DC government officials for requesting comments from citizens and would like to make the following comments to the sustainability report:

First, the report does not include critical information (actuarial tables) on which the information is based.

Second, the second attachment that should be included in the report is not there.

Third, as I understand it, the financing will always come from the largest insurers in DC. This means that the district residents that pay for insurance will be expected to make the system sustainable because the insurers will pass on the costs. This is the usual way of doing business because the insurers can't be expected to finance the system at a loss to their companies.

There are a few things that are not good for us, but we consume them anyway: tobacco, alcohol, sugar, and salt. These cause long-term illnesses in many cases (high blood pressure, diabetes, COPD and emphysema, alcoholism, etc.). It seems to me that if we want to have a healthier DC population, then the government has the authority (and should have the desire) to levy a tax on those products that are the most harmful to us. Those of us who wish to consume them can continue to do so but at higher personal cost.

Economists say that economic incentives are powerful and I happen to agree. In this case, an economic disincentive to consumers may result in some healthier people and in a sound and financially sustainable HBX.

In closing, I respectfully request the decision-makers to consider the above options.

Sincerely,

Maria Elena Anderson

From: Arthur Heimbald [mailto:aheimbold@erols.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 28, 2013 4:06 PM
To: Comments, FSR (DCHBX)
Subject: The usual

The usual question.

What group of tax payers are paying for all of this loving healthcare...or is it the Chinese? Right, you got it the 1%. Their cash should last about 2 months and then who pays...you sweet, lovable, progressive, democrats, right again, the ones who love arithmetic of debt! Wow, aren't they smart.

Statement:

- It is impossible to reform the Healthcares system...Why? Because there is no Healthcare system. Just hundreds of thousands of medical businesses that the government now wants to manage.
- Why do governments want to have a system they can control...Votes! Yes, indeed, votes. Pander, pander, pander.
- And comparing the US to European countries...those tired little financially unstable countries is nonsense...take just one aspect...geography...France, the largest country in Europe FITS inside of Texas...Germany fits inside of Montana.
- Guess who provides air ambulance service to the Canadian maritime provinces. Yes, you are right again...The USofA from Maine.

What the administration is dishing up for you is baloney on stale white...with no mustard + warm water. Choke it down y'all Liberals.

And who is not covered under Obamacare...Right again kiddies, The Prez and Congress. Those boys and girls understand the game.

Oh, I forgot all Obama's pals, they get a pass too!

A new national holiday baloney for the turkeys.

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: "Martin Atayo,Executive-in-Chief/ President" <MartinAtayo@mpgatechnology.com>
To: "frs.comments@dc.gov" <frs.comments@dc.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, December 4, 2013 8:00 AM
Subject: Fw: Public Comments Sought on HBX Draft Financial Sustainability Report

In reaction to public comments invitation as contained in forwarded email within the context of financial sustainability of DC Health Benefits, we herein, suggest as follow:

1) Exploiting and Applying Internet sales tax on all purchases, appropriately, carried out in District of Columbia zip codes and telephone landline and wireless dialing codes. Such taxes be made to support DC Health Benefits in the long term context, and at the same time, reducing primary premium burden on the part of insurance coverage beneficiaries, in consonant with Obamacare original idea conception to overcome inequality margin. This suggestion is further fostered by recent Supreme Court's smart decision to remain mute on matter of internet sales tax, pushing discretionary decision burden back to individual states.

2) We also suggest examination of introduction of gasoline sale tax at the pump in District of Columbia (e.g, 0.05% or ten cents only per gallon) for the purpose of financing DC Health Benefits in the long term context. These are not very visible sources of funding and sustaining DC Health Benefits, and therefore, are unlikely to provoke any public concern.

We wish to finally note that based on original Obamacare idea construct, grants from Federal Government only serve to support wages of employees working for Obamacare, and insurance Trust Fund is supposed to be structured to be state by state funds generating on top of basic subscription premium.

Thank you in advance for putting up the above two suggestions to all Board members attention.

Wishes of the Season.

Martin Atayo
(CEO/Technologist)
[MPGATECHNOLOGIES CORP](#)
P.O.Box 1689
Washington, DC 20013

Tel: 888-783-4311
202-491-7716
Twitter: [@mpgatechnology](#)

From: James Mullen [mailto:JMullen@delta.org]
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 12:53 PM
To: Comments, FSR (DCHBX)
Cc: Jeff Album; 'Kevin Wrege' (kwrege@pulseadvocacy.com)
Subject: DC Financial Sustainability Comments

Please find attached a comment letter on the November 25, 2013 draft Financial Sustainability Report issued by the D.C. Health Benefit Exchange Authority. We appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback on this important topic.

Sincerely,

James Mullen | Manager, Public and Government Affairs | jmullen@delta.org

Office 916-861-1668 | cell 916-397-7130 | fax 916-631-1101

Delta Dental of CA, NY, PA & Affiliates | 11155 International D41 | Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

We keep you smiling® | www.deltadentalins.com

December 5, 2013

SENT VIA EMAIL

District of Columbia Health Benefit Exchange Authority (DCHBX)

fsr.comments@dc.gov

RE: Financial Sustainability Report from the District of Columbia Health Benefit Exchange Authority

Dear Exchange Authority Staff:

On behalf of Delta Dental, I am writing to you today to address the November 25, 2013 draft Report on Financial Sustainability for the District of Columbia Health Benefit Exchange (DCHBX). This item concerns applicable user fees assessed against qualified health plans (QHP) and qualified dental plans (QDP).

As we understand, the DCHBX's current approach would base a user fee assessment on a percentage of the carrier's premium market share. The actual percentage of the assessment would be calculated based on a projection of the operating expenses of the Exchange and the previous year's total health insurance premium dollars. This percentage could therefore increase or decrease in percentage from year to year. Further, this assessment would apply for Qualified Dental Plans (QDPs), also based on premium market share, including outside Exchange business and individual, small group and large group business.

First, we fundamentally agree that any participating QDPs should be assessed user fees to help fund the District's Exchange. And we commend you on the idea that the application of the assessment should be done in proportion to a product's written/paid premium, which automatically adjusts so that each participating carrier pays in equal proportion to their book of business.

While we agree with the fundamentals, we also have two concerns:

1. The Exchange Authority is applying the assessment, its purpose to fund the exchange, to QDP plans that have for the most part been disallowed entry into the DCHBX. As we have stated in previous comment letters, without a requirement for at least a few QHPs to offer medical without dental inside the Exchange, there is no viable market for QDPs offering pediatric dental in compliance with the Affordable Care Act (ACA). The result is that the assessment is being applied to us and other standalone dental plans in the District, while the Exchange simultaneously denies us the opportunity to sell ACA-compliant pediatric dental in OR outside the exchange in the non-group and small group markets.
2. We must oppose any assessment on QDPs outside of the Exchange, as these plans reap none of the advantages or administrative functions provided by the Exchange. It makes sense to assess fees to issuers inside the Exchange because the Exchange is both marketing and facilitating the sale of products with the advantage of federal subsidies to improve their affordability. However, outside Exchange issuers do not receive any benefit from using the Exchange and must bear the full administrative burden of their products. Thus, fees applied outside will raise the pricing of those products without any return benefit for the consumer. QHP and QDP products sold outside the Exchange should be exempt from any assessment or fees charged to finance the Exchange. This will protect the affordability of coverage outside the Exchange and provide small

businesses and families in the District with additional avenues through which to purchase and/or retain their existing coverage.

We would welcome any opportunity to meet or speak with you and/or any appropriate staff to discuss these matters. Please know that we stand ready to help when it comes to implementing the dental benefit provisions of the health care reform law.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at (415) 972-8418.

Sincerely,

Jeff Album
Vice-President, Public and Government Affairs

From: Baker Enterprises [mailto:crying4phoenix@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 2:03 PM
To: Comments, FSR (DCHBX)
Subject: Comments on Financial Sustainability HBX

Mark E. Baker, MBA
P.O. Box 41205
Washington, DC 20018
December 6, 2013

Leighton Ku, Chair
Working Group on Financial Sustainability
DC Health Benefit Exchange Authority

Via email to fsr.comments@dc.gov

Dear Sir:

I am a small business owner in the District of Columbia and a licensed life and health insurance producer for DC, Maryland and Virginia. In response to your request for comments on financial sustainability of the DC Health Exchange, I would like to offer the following observations and concerns.

The current language of the proposal suggests that there will be an annual re-evaluation and potential increase in funding for the exchange. The report states, "It is important to note that the operating expenses of the Authority will vary from year to year. Thus the percentage assessment will vary from year to year, whatever the base." This seems to open up a black hole of continuing hikes in cost which will erode the essential benefits of ACA. Some mechanism for oversight or control of increases in cost needs to be specifically mandated. This is especially so since many federal workers will not need to participate in the exchange and the DC Council seems bent towards encouraging large employers to become situated within DC. These employers may not provide health benefits for their employees, preferring to shift the cost burden onto the exchange, or DC Alliance programs.

A result of the demographic change encouraged by the DC Council and Mayor is the increase in upper middle and upper income residents. This gentrification yields a healthier and wealthier population of residents. At the same time reticence to increase the minimum wage level will create an economic divide with more entrenched poverty for the lower wage citizens. This stratification of income can be expected to increase the number of persons requiring Medicaid or Alliance based services. Many of the wealthier residents may choose lower cost plans with higher deductibles reducing the amount of premiums contributed to the sustainability goals.

My suggestion would be to broaden the base of participating insurers. There is a counterpoint to the committee's conclusions concerning the convenience of administering the plan. The committee presumes an "administrative hassle" from a broader base of insurance carriers: "To minimize administrative hassle, Authority staff recommended that the assessment apply only to health insurance carriers with annual premiums of at least \$50,000. This threshold for assessment reduces the number of carriers to be assessed from 830 to 158, thereby saving the Authority the administrative burden of collecting small amounts of money from nearly 700 carriers that do little or no business in the District presently." The threshold should be adjusted to encourage broader participation.

Some smaller firms can have graduated levels of participation, based on premium based revenue, in order to encourage more firms to reach minimum levels of policy production in the District. By enhancing opportunities for these smaller firms to benefit from broader market expansion, encouraging business expansion or growth, you can assure greater choice and diversity of providers. While an administrative burden is relieved by the proposed plan, there is no compulsion that firms among the 158 with the required minimum premium activity will remain in place. The proposal has the effect of creating a barrier to entry for smaller firms or newer collaborative ventures.

There is one overriding observation that arises from the Medicaid based premium assessment suggested in your report. Medicaid alone will provide more than 40% of the projected revenue to fund ACA related costs in 2015. While the administrative costs of the exchange are very small (estimated up to \$25 million) there seem to be a significant over reach in revenue requirements. Your analysis suggests that the cost structure for the ACA is primarily regarded as an expansion of Medicaid based funding. Other revenue streams need to be included and I suggest considering excess revenue collected from traffic cameras and parking enforcement.

Sincerely,

Mark E. Baker, MBA



December 6, 2013

Sent via email only: fsr.comments@dc.gov

District of Columbia Health Benefit Exchange Authority 1100 15th Street
NW, 8th Floor
Washington, DC 20005

RE: Comments on DC HBX Draft Financial Sustainability Report

Dear Health Benefit Exchange Honorary Board and Committee Members:

I am writing on behalf of Principal Financial Group ("The Principal"). We appreciate the opportunity to provide input on the Draft Financial Sustainability Report and the proposed potential Exchange revenue sources.

The Principal offers life, annuity, disability income, dental and vision insurance products in all 50 states and the District of Columbia. Relevant to the proposed procedure, The Principal provides stand-alone dental coverage to nearly 6,000 enrollees in the District of Columbia. While The Principal will be providing coverage in DC as a stand-alone dental plan, The Principal will not be participating on the DC Health Benefit Exchange.

The proposed recommendation at issue addresses Exchange assessments and, as written, the proposed policy would apply to all District health insurance carriers. It is unclear if this recommendation excludes HIPAA excepted benefits.

It is Principal's position that HIPAA excepted benefits should not be subject to an assessment. Clearly, HIPAA excepted benefits do not realize the same advantages as the benefits that are subject to the Affordable Care Act ("ACA"). Therefore, we ask you to clarify that only those plans actually subject to the ACA are made subject to assessments and fees.

We trust you will take these comments into consideration in deciding on the issue of Exchange plan assessments. Thank you again for the opportunity to provide you with our perspective on these important issues.

Sincerely,



Catherine M. Drexler
Counsel - Government Relations 515-
247-9158
drexler.catherine@principal.com

s:\cgrda\staff\emd\hcr\dcexchange\120613dc

Mailing Address: Des Moines, Iowa USA 50392-0001 (515) 247-5111