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clean copy of the proposed amendments to Regulation 120-2-97; Exhibit 3 is a marked copy of the proposed amendments to Regulation 120-2-97; Exhibit 4 is an affidavit of publication with a copy of Notice of
Rulemaking as published in the Daily Report; Exhibit 5
is a copy of communication from the Office of
Legislative Counsel; Exhibit 6 are the comments
received concerning the surprise billing rule; and
Exhibit 7 are the comments received concerning the PBM rule.

May I approach?
MR. CONLEY: Yes.
THE COMMISSIONER: Are there any other
persons who would like to make oral comments? Please
make sure that you have signed in to the sign-in sheet
and state your name for the record.
Who do we have?
(Thereupon, an off-the-record discussion
was held.)
THE COMMISSIONER: Victor Moldovan?
MR. MOLDOVAN: Yes, sir.
THE COMMISSIONER: Sorry if I
mispronounced it.
MR. MOLDOVAN: Moldovan (pronunciation). ${ }_{25}$ That's fine. No problem.
interested persons could participate in the proposed rulemaking by submitting written comments to this office. Interested persons are also entitled to participate in today's hearing in making oral 5 arguments. As stated in the notice, oral comments 6 should be limited to five minutes per person in order 7 to allow all interested persons an opportunity to be heard. However, I may at my direction allow more time for any given presentation. Interested persons who would like to speak at this hearing need to sign the sign-in sheet and indicate they would like to speak.

At this spot -- at this time the
Department has several exhibits to be entered into the record and I'm going to ask a representative of the Department to identify those exhibits.

Mike?
MR. DAWSON: Good morning, Commissioner King. My name is Michael Dawson. I'm an attorney with the Department of Insurance. There's seven exhibits that the Department seeks to admit.
(Thereupon, marked for identification,
Department Exhibit Number D-1, D-2, D-3, D-4, D-5, D-6 and D-7.)

MR. DAWSON: Exhibit 1 is a clean copy of the proposed regulation, 120-2-106; Exhibit 2 is a

2 MR. MOLDOVAN: -- whose members -- the 3 members are private doctors in private practice in Georgia.

We had submitted some written comments. And during the course of the bill working it's way through the legislature, we had expressed concern back
then -- I think it was independent doctors back
then -- about the constitutionality of the statute.
We still have those concerns. We recognize that the agency needs to implement the statute as it's written, but I do want to point out that we continue to have concerns about the state government dictating private contracts in terms of how much private parties get paid, how much private parties should pay and we -and I pointed that out in our written comments, both under the state and federal constitutions, and I just want to again say that for the record.

In the course of actually looking at the rules, our concern continues to be sort of a race to the bottom a little bit in that once you start to have the state set rates for private doctors in terms of what they get paid, we are concerned that there will be an opportunity, an invitation to the payers to basically try to reduce the amount that those doctors
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And also a prohibition that there should be no manipulation of the payment data to support a lower payment rate. And the concern again is because the information from the payer -- that the state is going to rely on, even though I recognize the regs talk about using independent vendors to help figure that out, the information is coming from what the payers pay and the concern being that there should be some speed bumps or some sort of, you know, dates in terms of the payer's ability to use that data to try and reduce payments to our members, our doctors. So those are the primary concerns.
And then finally I just want to point out that the issue that is sort of -- again is sort of going to be the big sort of -- you know, as we go forward is what data does the state use to set these contracted rates. And I recognize that under Section .09 in the proposed rules the office has suggested or is saying it's going to use an independent vendor to basically make available the data. We think that that should be pretty transparent; whatever data is being used that it's available on the website, that we have the opportunity to come back to the agency and express our concerns about that and have input on that. And so we
get paid.
And, you know, an example, you know, not that this will happen but it may, is a doctor may have 4 a higher contracted rate today and then the 5 opportunity would be potentially for a payer to say, 6 well, the median contracted rate which is under the statute is lower, and find a way to basically push that doctor out of network. And that has been a primary concern of our members that that could happen, and, again, whether it's intentional or whether it's sort of a mission create where over time there's an opportunity to save money.

And the regulations and the statute give the payers the opportunity to do that, so we had suggested in our written submission a couple of thoughts in terms of trying to make it a little bit more vigorous and rigorous in terms of prohibiting that or at least slowing that down. And I specifically talk about in sections 106-.05 and 106-.06 that the regulations should include a specific provision prohibiting the plans, the payers from canceling or not renewing a network contract in order to allow the plans to pay a lower amount. If that's the reason they're doing it and there's evidence of that, that should be prohibited.
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appreciate the opportunity to do that.
And again, thank you for your time. I
appreciate it.
MR. CONLEY: Thank you very much.
MR. MOLDOVAN: Thank you.
THE COMMISSIONER: Dr. Brett Cannon.
DR. CANNON: I'll project a little bit here.

THE COMMISSIONER: How you doing, Doctor? DR. CANNON: Good morning. THE COMMISSIONER: Good morning. DR. CANNON: Thank you again. I'm Brett Cannon, here as a member of the Medical Association of Georgia and also a member of the Georgia College of Emergency Physicians.

I am someone who spent a lot of hours the last number of years, as did many others, across the street at the Capitol, on phone calls and meetings, reading draft legislation. But most importantly, as a physician who has practiced in Georgia for over 20 years and who has had the privilege to take care of over 100,000 Georgia patients -- I suppose some were passing through or visitors to our fine state -- but regardless, I've had a chance to talk to a lot of physicians. I know this is an important issue to
them. Whether we call it surprise billing or surprise insurance coverage, this has affected them.

And for years I've been able to say,
"Hey, a solution is coming," and it's kind of nice to be able to say, "Hey, we've got it." So again, that's kind of heartwarming.
I'd also like to point out the importance of the legislation rests in part with protecting those patients from those unanticipated out-of-network costs, but an equally valuable aspect, at least from emergency medicine, is maintaining access. And we've spoken at length about how there's importance of fair rates and reasonable contracting when it comes to attracting physicians and providing care and not putting additional cost on the hospitals, particularly in rural parts of the state.

I'd like to thank Commissioner King as well as Mr. Conley for all of your work as well as the Department's on these rules. I know it takes a lot of work and effort to kind of implement the legislation once it crosses the street. So again, we do appreciate your efforts.

MAG and GCEP have both submitted written comments that I think fully contain our feedback about the proposed rules, and I'd like to take just a few
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wouldn't be appropriate any more than it would be appropriate for an insurer or insurer-controlled company to provide that data solely. So we simply call for a fair, transparent, verifiable and independent database to be used.
We'd like to see the Prudent Layperson standard included in the reference to a medical necessity for any payment denials. The importance of adhering to the PLP was recently recognized by the 11th Circuit. They reinstated the lawsuit by MAG and GCEP on behalf of Georgia physicians against Anthem of
Georgia in regard to the retrospective denials of emergency care in reversing the dismissal by the
District Court, recognizing the importance and the mandate required by the Prudent Layperson standard.

We are also asking for additional clarity on the arbitration process and would like to ensure the transparency to reduce information asymmetry between insurers and physicians as emphasized. That imbalance will hamper efforts to close claims without arbitration. And again, we'd like for things to go smoothly, as easy for both sides as possible.

And then finally, we're asking for more
clarity around the parameters of cost estimate and consent required when a patient chooses out-of-network

1 minutes to highlight a couple of concerns that are of 2 particular importance.

Number 1, I'd first like to emphasize the importance of removing the six-month limitation on the 5 previously-contracted rate. I think that's Item 13 6 under the definitions. I can't overemphasize enough the importance of that specific previous rate provision that came to getting the agreement on 888 passed. Finding a fair standard that both insurers and physicians were able to come to previously in a market transaction as a fallback when there's not a contract was really key in moving them forward after many years of efforts had failed to do so.

Limiting the lookback to six months would encourage the exact behavior that the bill was contemplating -- that language was designed to prevent. It largely unhinges the bill from the foundation of fairness and compromise that we designed, and I believe there's been communication from the legislature that that was -- that would be contrary to the intent of the bill. So we feel very strongly about that.

From the outset, again, it seemed like there was not going to be funding for the APCD. I have a database I'd be glad to provide, but that
care. Importantly, maintaining patient choice was contemplated in this bill and preservation of that intent is very important.

MAG and GCEP certainly look forward to working with the Department on the revisions and 6 implementation of the rules as well as developing the arbitration process and selecting the vendor for the database. We certainly appreciate your time this morning.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much, Doctor.

DR. CANNON: Thank you.
THE COMMISSIONER: Mark Middleton?
MR. MIDDLETON: Yes, sir, I'm here on behalf of the pharmacy. Do you want to go ahead and hear that or are you getting all of the (inaudible) first?

THE COMMISSIONER: I guess we didn't -(Thereupon, an off-the-record discussion was held between Commissioner King and Mr. Conley.)

THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. Let's hold off, Mark, because I want to make sure that we keep our comments in order --

MR. MIDDLETON: Yes, sir.

THE COMMISSIONER: -- if you don't mind. Anna Adams?
MS. ADAMS: Good morning. Thank you, Commissioner, and thank you, everybody, for having this today.
I am Anna Adams. I'm with the Georgia Hospital Association. And on behalf of our 161 member hospitals in the state of Georgia, I want to thank you for the opportunity to speak today and thank the bill's authors and everyone who worked so tirelessly on this effort over the past eight years to get it done.

I will just highlight a few points that
were in our comment letter that we submitted on
November the 12 th. These are the points that I think
from the Association's standpoint are kind of a priority for us.

First and foremost, this act is effective January 1st, 2021. However, the arbitration organization does not have to be selected until July 1, 2021. So we think this effectively leaves providers and facilities with no recourse in the event that a provider feels they have not been paid adequately. So we would respectfully request that the enforcement of House Bill 888 and the proposed rule be
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we do have concerns that this could lead patients to assign this rating to the facility and see it as kind of a rating of quality as opposed to a rating of the
plans and it puts at a disadvantage the facilities
that don't offer those particular services like specialty hospitals, hospitals that don't have an emergency department. They would have a lower rating in that instance. So we would ask that you stick just to the room checkmarks and the red Xs as prescribed in the legislation.

And that concludes my comments. Thank
you very much.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much.
MS. ADAMS: Thank you, sir.
(Thereupon, an off-the-record discussion
was held.)
THE COMMISSIONER: Pamela Pope (sic)?
MS. POPE: Good morning, Commissioner.
My name is Jamila Pope. I am --
THE COMMISSIONER: I am sorry. I
mispro- --
MS. POPE: Oh, that's okay.
THE COMMISSIONER: You have wonderful
handwriting. I just...
MS. POPE: It's okay.
delayed in the interim until a resolution organization is selected and operational.

The second point that I would like to make today that is a priority is that House Bill 888 only regulates provider billing of nonemergency medical services in situations where a surprise bill 7 may arise. Instances where a patient may unknowingly receive nonemergency hospital services from an out-of-network facility are fairly limited.
Section 120-2-106.6(5), we would ask that you remove this section in its entirety to remain consistent with House Bill 888 and legislative intent.

With regard to House Bill 789, the Surprise Billing Transparency Act, the GHO recommends health plans be required to list network participation and qualified groups and not individual physicians. As physicians are coming onto and off of their network plans, these can sometimes take time and we don't want to confuse patients into thinking an entire group is out of network when one new physician could potentially skew that rating.

And then finally, the references to zero to four rating factor in Section 122-106-11 of the proposed rule, we recommend that be deleted. That particular reference was not a part of the statute and
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I am Jamila Pope of Children's Healthcare of Atlanta, and we just want to agree with the comments that the Georgia Hospital Association offered, but just a couple of clarifying requests that we would like to see.

With regards to the comparison of specialties and subspecialties under the contracted amount definition, we would like to make sure that the -- that the Department of Insurance determine the application of the same or similar specialty or subspecialty, and we'd also like to see a reference added that is based on the predominant age of the patients served by the provider. So a peds-to-peds comparison versus an adults-to-peds comparison.

One other issue that we would like to see a little clarity around would be the provider -- the obligation for the payer to tell the provider whether they are in or out of network. There is -- as I understand it, there would -- the provider would be required to have someone constantly checking to see if the disclosure that the payer is providing is actually up to date and accurate which would be somewhat burdensome on the provider to be checking that constantly. So we would just like some clarity around that.

1 And if there are no questions, that ends 2 my comments.

```
4 MS. POPE: Thank you.
```

5 THE COMMISSIONER: Ethan James?
6 MR. JAMES: No, sir, not testifying.
7 THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. Mark Middleton?
8 MR. MIDDLETON: Commissioner, thank you for the opportunity to be here today. I'm here on behalf of PCMA, which is the Pharmaceutical Care Medical Association. We filed comments in regard to 20-2-97 (sic), the Pharmacy Benefits Management Regulation.

Our comments basically fell in three categories. I thought I would just take this five minutes to kind of outline what those -- the intentions of those comments were in regard to each and appreciating this -- the Department's efforts and your efforts since you've been in office to point toward compliance for regulated industries.

And as you can imagine, this being a new regulation, you know, one of the things that we focused on was making sure that the rule stayed within the scope of the statute and was reasonable as required by Georgia law. So you'll see a number of
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otherwise.
Also under that kind of general category of due process, the statute on 2-97 had referred to a -- had provided for a statutory right for a continuance on the initial filings next year. Again, I think that contemplates that this is a newly regulated situation, there's going to be some growing pains and some -- and some -- some accommodation that has to be made, and so we proposed that language that would -- that would have included that language into the rules so that both your staff and the parties recognize they have that right to continue next year when they do these initial filings. And that's, you know, obviously within the context of the statute.

And then finally, you know, we added a couple of instances where we requested and suggested that the rules contain reference to ERISA, the Georgia Open Records Act, et cetera. You know, there are instances where the -- documents that are produced requiring confidentiality would be subject to the exceptions of the Open Records Act law. Obviously there are -- would be a category of complaints, as there always is in this space, that are covered by ERISA or federal law rather than state law and so it is our request that that be referenced.
comments that point to that issue. For example -- and I'm obviously not going to go through them all -- but one highlight in our outline was there was -- you know, in the statute there were some exclusions, the state health plan and other plans. We -- you know, we made some proposed revisions that would add that language to the statute.

Secondly, you know, we wanted to make sure that -- that the rules were very clear in terms of what the obligations were for parties that have been noticed or have complaints filed against them and that there are also reasonable time periods in regard to being responsive to those filings. And so you'll see throughout the document where the rules have set forth a five-business-day standard that we are requesting that that be changed throughout the document to 14 calendar days. That is, I think, more consistent with some of the other deadlines that you have elsewhere in the code and in the statute. And, you know, given the potential voluminous filings that are coming your way, which I'm sure you're all thrilled about, you know, it gives the parties an opportunity to get a more -- you know, a higher quality response and to -- and to just limit some of the back and forth that would inevitably go on
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And I recognize that some of the comments we made are probably more procedural than substantive and there's some discussion to be had around the more substantive categories and we'd be happy to engage in that. I appreciate the opportunity to be here today and look forward to working with you towards the completion of these rules.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much.
MR. MIDDLETON: Thank you, sir.
THE COMMISSIONER: Appreciate it.
Greg Reysold?
MR. REYSOLD: Yes, sir.
Mr. Commissioner, I very much appreciate the opportunity to be here today. My name is Greg Reysold. I represent the Georgia Pharmacy Association, and we are here to speak in favor of the regulations as promulgated. I think that our membership was heartened to see the work that went into this and I think we firmly believe that the regulations and the rules track very closely with the spirit of the law and that was encouraging to see.

You know, it's been a long time coming. The last PBM regulation was promulgated I think sometime in 2011, so it's been a long time and there's been significant work done over the years on the part

Page 25
of the General Assembly. And this year was really, I would say, a sweeping update to the Pharmacy Benefit Managers code and it looked to do a couple of things: It looked to strengthen patient protections, increase transparency, and greatly expand your authority to regulate pharmacy benefit managers. I think that's what the law looked to do and I think that that's what your regulations give life to.
PCMA, no surprise, everybody sit down for this, this is going to shock people, we don't share the view of PCMA on -- with regard to the public comments. I would note certainly, I think, that, you know, extending deadlines from 5 to 14 days and acknowledging a couple of some of those other points, I think there's certainly points in agreement there or points that are reasonable.

What I'd like to really emphasize, though, is I couldn't disagree more with PCMA's stated position in writing regarding ERISA, and I'm going to talk -- talk to you about that for just a few minutes. And before I do that, I just want to say I hold Mark Middleton in the highest regard. I -- my strong suspicion here is, you know, he hadn't been working on this for a real long time and that some of those comments, you know, may even come from him.
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There were oral arguments in October. I don't know what the decision will be, but obviously that will shed a lot of light on the issue, but for them to come into the General Assembly and decide not to have an explicit ERISA carve-out and make a representation that this is clear law and that there should be notice of redemption when there's a pending Supreme Court case that they are a party to I take tremendous issue with.

I would also note and don't want to overburden you, and we can submit some additional comments, but PCMA requested an explicit carve-out when they were sued in other states when there was an explicit ERISA carve-out. One of the ways to implicate ERISA and run afoul of ERISA is to reference ERISA and carve ERISA out.
It gets a little bit circular, but it's a
Trojan horse. They're requesting language that they
were sued on in other states. And so that's sort of addressing, I would say, the overall broad ERISA issue.

Now I'd like to drill down into the
surcharge issue as well because they -- on top of
asking for it broader as a carve-out, they asked for a specific ERISA carve-out on the PBM surcharge. And

But I take tremendous issue, and I think there's insidiousness in it, they in an overarching request requested an ERISA carve-out for all of these regulations. First of all, the General Assembly had they wanted an ERISA carve-out, they would have put an ERISA carve-out just like they did for the surprise billing. They chose not to.
PCMA certainly tried to get that ERISA
carve-out into the General Assembly during the session and it was rejected, but I think more important than that, they sort of make this sweeping generalization, hey, PBM regulations are preempted by federal law. And they cite some case precedent and that's great, but here's what they don't cite. There's a case pending right now before the U.S. Supreme Court. It's called PCMA v. Rutledge and it's looking at the very issue of whether states can regulate PBMs in the ERISA market.

PCMA's letter doesn't cite that. They don't mention it. They don't reference it. They're a party to the case before the U.S. Supreme Court. So for them to make representation that PBM law is somehow preempted and that it's settled law when the U.S. Supreme Court granted cert because it's not settled law...
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there's a Supreme Court case, and it's New York Blue Cross Blue Shield versus Travelers, where the Supreme Court held explicitly that surcharges aren't preempted by ERISA, surcharges are good and they can be enforced 5 across markets.

So for PCMA to not reference that case, they weren't a party to that case, maybe they don't a know about it, but I would be surprised. Because in the Supreme Court oral arguments that case was mentioned more than 50 times in oral arguments in October, which PCMA was a part of, more than 50 times. And their counsel, Lassman (phonetic), in that particular case went out of his way to try to distinguish surcharges from other PBM regulations.

So surcharges should be enforced across the market. We're good with the Medicare carve-out. I think the Medicare Act rightfully preempts that.

And so I leave you with this: A lot of
comments I think are esoteric. This is dense stuff, and so I'd just like as we go through this process -and we welcome the opportunity to work with your office on this -- as we go through this process to keep in mind what the purpose of the General Assembly was here and that was to protect patients, as many patients as possible, protect patients from steering,
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| space (1) | strengthen (1) | terms (7) | $27: 18$ | visitors (1) |
| $23: 23$ | $25: 4$ | $9: 14,22 ; 10: 16,17$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { trouble (1) } \\ 8 \cdot 14 \end{gathered}$ | $12: 23$ |
| sparker@ocigagov (1) | strong (1) | $11: 10 ; 22: 9 ; 29: 11$ | $8: 14$ | voluminous (1) |
| $3:$ speak (5) | $\begin{gathered} 25: 22 \\ \text { strongly (1) } \end{gathered}$ | testifying (1) | $\begin{gathered} \text { true (1) } \\ 30: 9 \end{gathered}$ | 22:20 |
| speak (5) 6:10,11;17:9;24:16; | strongly ${ }_{\text {14:22 }}$ | thereto (1) | $\operatorname{try}(3)$ | W |
| 29:21 | stuff (1) | 30:17 | 9:25;11:10;28:13 |  |
| specialties (1) | 28:19 | Thereupon (4) | trying (1) | way (4) |
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| $1: 25$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{X}$ |  |  |
| $\mathbf{X s}(\mathbf{1})$ <br> $19: 9$ |  | 2 |
|  | $\mathbf{Y}$ |  |


|  | 2011 (1) |
| :---: | :---: |
| year (3) | 24:24 |
| 23:5,12;25:1 | 2020 (2) |
| years (6) | 1:15;30:18 |
| 12:17,21;13:3; 14:13:17:11:24:25 | 2021 (2) |
| 14:13;17:11;24:25 York (1) | $\begin{array}{r} 17: 19,21 \\ \mathbf{2 0 - 2 - 9 7}(\mathbf{1}) \end{array}$ |

