

RECEIVED

YOUNG RICCHIUTI CALDWELL & HELLER, LLC
SUITE 3800
1600 MARKET STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103
FAX: (267) 546-1039
www.yrchlaw.com

2008 JAN 14 PM 3:42

INDEPENDENT REGULATORY
REVIEW COMMISSION

2654

GREGORY B. HELLER
DIRECT DIAL: (267) 546-1004
gheller@yrchl.com

January 14, 2008

By fax

Janice Staloski, Director
Bureau of Community Program Licensure
and Certification
132 Kline Plaza, Suite A
Harrisburg, PA 17104

**Re: Department of Health Proposed Regulation No. 10-86
Regarding Confidentiality of Addiction Treatment Records**

Dear Ms. Staloski:

I write to respond to respond to the Department of Health's Proposed Regulation No. 10-186, which relates to the confidentiality of addiction treatment records. Those regulations would have a direct bearing on the practical application of issues that are now before the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, and would also have a direct bearing on current regulatory guidance from the Pennsylvania Insurance Department.

**A Pending Supreme Court Case on Act 106 Will Decide Whether Insurers Can Carry
Out Intrusive Medical Necessity Reviews**

The proposed new regulations could imperil the consumer protections found in Act 106 of 1989, 40 Pa. Stat. §§ 908-1 to 908-6, and on the regulatory guidance regarding Act 106 set forth in the Insurance Department's Notice 2003-06, titled *Drug and Alcohol Use and Dependency Coverage*, 33 Pa. Bulletin 4041 (August 9, 2003). As a general matter, Act 106 is intended to permit patients with group health insurance coverage to receive addiction treatment without medical necessity reviews or other managed care interference. The Insurance Department and the Attorney General are now enforcing this important law. The Insurance Federation and a coalition of managed care companies have challenged the Insurance Department's reading of the law. On July 26, 2007, a unanimous panel of the Commonwealth Court decided the case in favor of the Insurance Department. The Insurance Federation has appealed the case to the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, and the parties are in the midst of the briefing process.

Janice Staloski, Director
January 14, 2008
Page 2

Thus, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court is set to decide whether or not managed care insurers can carry out medical necessity reviews, with respect to patients and patient days that fall within Act 106.

In the proposed regulations, the Department of Health takes a position that in practical effect sides with the managed care industry in this dispute. What's worse, it does so in a way that could potentially be used to seriously dilute the effect of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court's decision on medical necessity reviews. Here's why.

Addiction treatment facilities know from hard experience that managed care companies routinely demand, from facilities, detailed information and documents about patients. All too often – indeed, routinely – managed care companies demand information that the facilities are not, under the current regulations, permitted to provide. Facilities respond by pointing to the confidentiality regulations, and provide only the information that the regulations allow them to provide. Because confidentiality regulations are the only real bulwark against these managed care demands for information, we know that everything that is allowed to be disclosed will be disclosed.

Addiction treatment facilities also know from hard experience that managed care companies routinely take the position that they cannot tell whether a particular patient is entitled to the protections of Act 106. As a result managed care companies demand – as a condition of authorization and therefore payment – that the facilities produce detailed patient information for every patient, even those entitled to the protections of Act 106. Because the patient needs treatment **immediately** and because facilities need to be (and are entitled to be) reimbursed, facilities must and do accede to these demands up to the limits of what the current regulations permit, even for Act 106 patients. While this does pose some threat to patient confidentiality under the current rules, the harm caused by the managed care companies' feigned ignorance of (or deliberate indifference to) Act 106 status is limited because the information at stake is limited.

The proposed regulations, by contrast, will allow managed care companies to demand everything covered in the broad language of section (c)(2)(ii) (or, potentially, everything covered in the even broader language of sections (c)(1) (which places no limits at all on the types of information disclosed) and (c)(2)(i) (which contains no meaningful limitation)).

Thus, we know that under these proposed rules every patient – even patients otherwise entitled to the protections of Act 106, which *on its face prohibits this sort of managed care interference* – will be subject to the intrusive, care-limiting scrutiny of the managed care company. This is a wrong that cannot be righted at some later time, because with the managed care company looking over the facility's shoulder, the patient will get less treatment or won't get treatment at all.

I hasten to add that I am not claiming that these regulations were deliberately intended to work an end-run around Act 106. Nor am I claiming that the proposed regulations were intentionally

Janice Staloski, Director
January 14, 2008
Page 3


designed to provide the managed care companies with a "second line of defense", guarding the managed care companies against the effects of a possible defeat in the Supreme Court. I don't know who came up with this language, or what their intentions were when they did so. What I do know, however, is that if one were indeed to set out to craft regulations that could be used to indirectly but effectively damage the practical availability of Act 106's protections, it would be hard to do better than the proposed changes to the confidentiality regulations.

The Proposed Regulations Would Affect Existing Regulatory Guidance

As explained above, the proposed regulations would have profound practical effects on the regulatory guidance set forth in the Insurance Department's Notice 2003-06. For that reason, I respectfully disagree with the Department of Health's statement, in 27 item of the Regulatory Analysis Form ("RAF"), that the proposed regulations would have no effect on existing regulatory guidance.

The Pennsylvania Supreme Court is set to decide whether or not managed care companies can scrutinize and second-guess decisions made by addiction treatment facilities, when they provide addiction treatment to patients who fall within Act 106. I respectfully submit that this issue should be decided by the Pennsylvania Supreme Court in the case that is now before it, not by the Department of Health through changes to confidentiality regulations.

Very truly yours,



GREGORY B. HELLER

GBH/ld

cc (by fax): Independent Regulatory Review Commission
Senator Edwin Erickson
Senator Vincent Hughes
Representative Frank Oliver
Representative George Kenney

FAX TRANSMITTAL SHEET

YOUNG RICCHIUTI CALDWELL & HELLER, LLC
 1600 MARKET STREET
 SUITE 3800
 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103
 www.yrchlaw.com

2654

Date: January 14, 2008

Number of Pages (including this cover): 4

To: Janice Staloski, Director - 717-787-3188
 Independent Regulatory Review Commission - 717-783-~~2264~~
 Senator Edwin Erickson - 717-787-0196
 Senator Vincent Hughes - 717-772-0579
 Representative Frank Oliver - 717-783-0684
 Representative George Kenney - 717-787-4810

2664

Recipient's Phone #:

Sender: Gregory B. Heller, Esquire

Sender's Phone #: 267-546-1004

Comments:

INDEPENDENT REGULATORY
 REVIEW COMMISSION

2008 JAN 14 PM 3:42

RECEIVED

CONFIDENTIALITY: The documents accompanying this transmission contain information which is confidential and/or legally privileged and is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named on this transmission sheet. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this faxed information is strictly prohibited and that the documents should be returned to this firm immediately. In this regard, if you have received this fax in error, please notify us by telephone immediately so that we can arrange for the return of the original documents to us at no cost to you.