

>> I -- I HAD, VICKI SCHMIDT, I HAD ASKED FOR A HISTORY OF THE EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYEE RATES, BUT I THINK WHAT IS CONFUSING ABOUT THAT IS ONE OF THEM IS ON CALENDAR YEAR, AND ONE IS ON FISCAL YEAR, AND SO THEY DON'T MATCH UP IN, WE ARE SIX MONTHS -- >> WE ARE, BUT FROM A PERSPECTIVE OF THE PLAN, THE STATE ADJUSTS ACCORDINGLY TO ACCOMMODATE AN INSURER, SO I THINK WE ALWAYS LOOK, AND THIS IS COMMISSIONER BURNS-WALLACE, FROM THE PLAN YEAR PERSPECTIVE BECAUSE THAT'S HOW THE PLAN RUNS AND THAT'S HOW EMPLOYEES ARE IMPACTED AND THEN THE STATE ADJUSTS AS NEEDED IN RELATIONSHIP TO THE FISCAL BUDGET. AND THAT'S WHY WE DO WORK CLOSELY WITH BUDGET TO MAKE SURE THEY MAKE ADJUSTMENTS AND ACCOMMODATIONS IN RELATIONSHIP OF, THEY KNOW EVERY TIME THAT WE MAKE PLAN CHANGE DESIGNS THAT THEY HAVE TO LOOK ACROSS MULTIPLE FISCALS AS THEY DO IT ON THE STATE SIDE. DOES THAT HELP, COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT? I KNOW IT'S NOT CLEAN, BUT IT'S STILL VERY REFLECTIVE OF THE NATURE OF THE PLAN AND THE FUNDING ASSOCIATED WITH IT. I THINK THE STATE TAKES A LITTLE BIT MORE OF A BURDEN TO MAKE SURE IT'S ADJUSTING ACCORDINGLY AND ACCOMMODATING ACROSS FISCALS WHEN THE VARIATIONS HAPPEN. ANYTHING ELSE FROM, AND WITH THE FINANCIAL REPORT? ANY OTHER QUESTIONS, COMMISSIONERS, OR ANYTHING FROM OUR PARTNER AT SEGAL? GREAT. HEARING NONE, THANK YOU SO MUCH, THAT'S THE END OF OUR FINANCIAL REPORTS. WE ARE GOING TO MOVE INTO OUR NEW BUSINESS. >> ALL RIGHT. ALL RIGHT, COMMISSIONERS. OUR FIRST -- MULTIPLE PIECES OF PAPER IN FRONT OF ME. OUR FIRST ITEM ON NEW BUSINESS IS OUR PLAN YEAR 2022 DESIGN, AND COMMISSIONERS, THANK YOU SO MUCH FOR THE MAY, I THINK IT WAS THE MAY 21 MEETING THAT WE HAD DOING SOME EARLY MODELLING. I THINK ALSO TO THE E.A.C. AND OTHERS THAT PROVIDED FEEDBACK AND ALSO COMMISSIONERS WHO HAVE HAD QUESTIONS IN THE IN BETWEEN TRYING TO PREPARE AND MAKE SURE THEY UNDERSTOOD KIND OF WHERE WE ARE AS WE START TO DO THIS RECOMMENDATION. ONE OF THE THINGS WE DID, WE

KNEW WE WOULD NEED TO LEAVE A BIT OF A BUFFER OF TIME SO THAT WE COULD CONTINUE TO DO A LITTLE BIT OF MODELLING AS WE GO TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS, SO I'M GOING TO ASK THAT WE PULL UP THE MODELLING DOCUMENT. CAN ALL MY COMMISSIONERS SEE THAT ON A PARTICULAR SCREEN? I'M LOOKING AT, OK. AND IF YOU NEED, ON MULTIPLE SCREENS SO IF YOU HAVE TO TURN. IT'S AN INTERACTIVE DOCUMENT THAT WE ARE GOING TO PLAY WITH. I'M GOING TO KICK US OFF IN A SPACE TRYING TO TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION MUCH OF WHAT WE HAVE HEARD OVER THE LAST FEW MONTHS AS WELL AS WHAT I'VE HEARD FROM COMMISSIONERS AROUND PRIORITIES IN THE E.A.C., AND SO I'M GOING TO THROW OUT A MODELLING SCENARIO AND THEN ASK THE COMMISSIONERS WE WORK FROM THERE TO MAKE CHANGES TO WALK TOWARDS A FORMAL RECOMMENDATION AS WE DO THIS. SO I'M ACTUALLY, I WANT TO MAKE SURE FIRST OF ALL WE SEE, EVERYONE SEES WHAT IS CURRENTLY UP IS THE CURRENT ASSUMPTION BASE AS THE MODEL PUSHES US TO, WHICH CREATES A 4.7 ACROSS 22, 23, 24 AS WE ARE LOOKING AT THE EMPLOYER AND THE EMPLOYEE CONTRIBUTION. IF WE GO TO THE PROJECT, PROJECTION SUMMARY TAB, THESE ARE THE THINGS THAT WE'LL BE COMING BACK TO BECAUSE IT HELPS US UNDERSTAND THE IMPACT ON COST OF THE PLAN, AS WELL AS OUR OVERALL RESERVES AND SO AS WE CAN SEE FROM HERE, THERE IS -- EXCUSE ME, COMMISSIONERS, AS I TURN AROUND. THERE IS -- THIS PULLS IN THE MODEL AND THEN SHOWS WHERE OUR TARGET RESERVES, OUR ENDING BALANCE AND WHERE OUR CURRENT TARGET RESERVES ARE PROJECTED. UNDERSTANDING, ALWAYS GOING BACK TO REMEMBERING THAT THIS PARTICULAR MODEL IS BASED ON OUR SET ASSUMPTIONS. IF SOME OF THOSE ASSUMPTIONS CHANGES, IT COULD CHANGE THE MODEL, BUT THE MODEL THAT WE ARE WORKING WITH HAS THOSE ASSUMPTIONS IN THEM AND WE HAVE THE ABILITY TO MOVE IN AND AROUND THOSE IF WE DEEM THAT'S WHERE WE WANT TO GO. SO, JUST WANTING TO BE CLEAR THAT WE REMEMBER THAT ASPECT, SO THE LINES THAT WILL BE IMPORTANT AND I BELIEVE, ARE MY YELLOW THE ONES

THAT WILL STAY? SO, THIS IS THE HARD MODEL OF HOW THE CURRENT MODEL PUSHES US TO. WHEN WE START TO MAKE SOME CHANGES, THOSE YELLOW LINES WILL STAY BECAUSE YOU CAN SEE THEN HOW IT IS COMPARED TO HOW THE MODEL DRIVES US, IF YOU REMEMBER BASED ON WHAT WE WERE DOING LAST TIME SO WE'LL SEE THE LINES ABOVE THOSE YELLOW LINES ADJUST AS WE MAKE ADJUSTMENTS TO BE ABLE TO UTILIZE DOLLARS THAT FOR INSTANCE MIGHT BE PART OF A PLUS IN AN EFFORT TO MAKE CHANGE MODIFICATIONS TO THE PLAN. SO I'M GOING TO KICK US OFF, IF WE CAN GO TO PLAN CHANGE SUMMARY BASED ON FEEDBACK WE HEARD FROM THE E.A.C. AND THINGS THAT WE HAVE GATHERED AND LOOKED AT OVER THE LAST YEAR AND ALSO WITH COMMISSIONERS THAT HAVE RAISED INTEREST AND SOME OF OUR MODELLING LAST TIME. I'M GOING TO KICK US OFF BY STARTING IN A PLACE AND AS I SAID, COMMISSIONERS, WE ARE STILL MODELLING, SO THESE ARE NO FORMAL RECOMMENDATIONS BUT IT'S A PLACE TO GET US STARTED. SO LET'S START, AND ONE OF THE THINGS DRIVING AGAIN WHEN WE TALK ABOUT SOME OF THE PRIORITIES AND INTERESTS, ONE OF THE THINGS WE HEARD FROM THE E.A.C. WAS AROUND OUT OF POCKET AND ALSO AN INTEREST IN DEDUCTIBLES, AND TWO THINGS THERE. ONE, THERE IS SOME OUT OF POCKET MODELLING HERE THAT WE CAN DEFINITELY PULL IN AND WE DID LAST TIME, WITH THE DEDUCTIBLE, YOU'LL SEE AT LEAST AS WHERE I AM STARTING, THE ONLY PLAN WE ARE ABLE TO MAKE CHANGE IN THE DEDUCTIBLE BECAUSE OF FEDERAL GUIDELINES IS IN PLAN A, AND WE DID MAKE A CHANGE IN THE DEDUCTIBLE LAST YEAR SO I'M JUST GOING TO START BY NOT INCLUDING THAT BUT IT'S HERE AND CAN BE MODELED IF WE WANT TO PULL IT IN. SO, I'M ACTUALLY LOOKING AT ALSO TRYING TO FOCUS ON I THINK WE HEARD FEEDBACK, WHERE IS THE DOLLARS CAN IMPACT MEMBERS OF THE PLAN. YOU KNOW, THEIR DAY-TO-DAY IN THEIR POCKET, SO I'M GOING TO ASK US TO START MODELLING BY INCORPORATING, REDUCING FOR PLAN A THE CO-PAY FROM 40 TO 30 AND THEN ALSO ACROSS EACH OF THE PLANS, REDUCING THE OUT OF POCKET AND RIGHT NOW I'M GOING TO START WITH,

THERE ARE TWO DIFFERENT, ON SOME OF THE PLANS, TWO DIFFERENT OPTIONS. I'M GOING TO START WITH THE SMALLER REDUCTION, 250 TO 500 IN MOST CASES BUT FOR A FEW PLANS LIKE C, ONLY ONE OPTION MODELLING RIGHT NOW, IT'S A LITTLE BIT LARGER, 1,000 TO 2,000. SO IF WE CAN GO THROUGH J, N AND THE OTHERS, AND GRAB THE OUT OF POCKET DEDUCTION, AND Q, THE OTHER THING WE TALKED ABOUT AND WHEN WE WERE MODELLING LAST TIME MOST COMMISSIONERS SEEMED THE IDEA OF BEING ABLE TO REDUCE THE CO-INSURANCE ON PREFERRED AND NONPREFERRED WAS, YOU KNOW, IT WASN'T A LARGE AMOUNT BUT COULD IMPACT PEOPLE SPECIFICALLY. I'M GOING TO START THAT BY INCLUDING THAT ACROSS ALL PLANS AND AGAIN, WE CAN CHANGE THESE AS WE MOVE THROUGH. ALL RIGHT. SO WHAT WE HAVE DONE HERE IS MODELED A DECREASE IN OUT OF POCKET, A DECREASE IN THE CO-PAY FOR PLAN A. THE OTHER ONES DO NOT -- THE PLAN C DOESN'T HAVE THAT SAME OPTION, AND ACROSS ALL PLANS REDUCTION IN THE CO-INSURANCE FOR THE PREFERRED AND NONPREFERRED BRAND DRUGS. SO, LET'S GO TO THE ASSUMPTION TAB AND CAN YOU REBALANCE THAT BEFORE WE DO ANYTHING ELSE? OK. SO, THAT, OF COURSE, HAS AN IMPACT BUT WE KNOW WE CAN SMOOTH SOME OF THAT AS WE LOOK AT THINGS. I WOULD ALSO LIKE, AS WE START OUR ASSUMPTIONS TO MAKE SOME ADJUSTMENTS TO OUR CONTRIBUTION, BECAUSE THAT ALSO IS KEY AND CRITICAL TO KEEPING MONEY IN POCKETS. SO, CAN WE START WITH THE EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION AROUND, LET'S DO 4.3. AND THEN EMPLOYEE AT 2.5. EMPLOYEE AND SPOUSE, 1.5. EMPLOYEE AND CHILDREN, 2.5. AND FAMILY AT 1.5. AND FOR COMMISSIONERS THAT ARE NEWER, AND PLEASE MODEL THE SAME FOR THE NONMEDICARE RETIREE CONTRIBUTIONS IN THE SAME CATEGORY AT THE EMPLOYEE, THE SAME RATES. ONE OF THE THINGS WE HAVE DONE THE LAST TWO YEARS, WE HAVE MADE SOME SLIGHT ADJUSTMENTS IN BETWEEN EMPLOYEE AND EMPLOYEE AND CHILDREN VERSUS EMPLOYEE STAFF AND FAMILY BECAUSE HISTORICALLY THERE'S BEEN A LITTLE BIT MORE OF A, I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE WORD -- BEEN A LITTLE MORE UNBALANCED IN

THAT SPACE AND SO WE HAVE TRIED TO MAKE SOME OF THOSE TO SMOOTH SOME OF THAT OUT. SO OF THIS THEN TAKING ALL THE ASSUMPTIONS ON THE PLAN CHANGE SUMMARY, AND ADJUSTING THESE RATES ACCORDINGLY, CAN YOU REBOUND -- HOPEFULLY I DIDN'T BREAK IT. OK. THERE YOU GO. AND LET'S GO TO OUR PROJECTION SUMMARY. ALL RIGHT. OK. SO IF WE LOOK, AND SO AGAIN, COMMISSIONERS, I KNOW IT'S A LOT OF DIFFERENT LINES, BUT IF WE LOOK AT KIND OF THE ENDING BALANCE, THE YELLOW OF THAT BASELINE OF THE ENDING BALANCE SHOWED THE FORMAL MODEL, YOU CAN SEE WE ARE BRINGING DOWN THAT ENDING BALANCE. THE MODEL WILL FORCE IT BACK BUT YOU'LL SEE THAT WE ARE DIPPING A LITTLE BIT FURTHER INTO THE RESERVE WHICH I DON'T THINK WE ARE OPPOSED TO, AND SO THIS GIVES US A LITTLE BIT OF SHOWING WHAT THAT DIFFERENCE BASELINE AND REMEMBER, THAT'S THE YELLOW, SHOWS YOU WHAT THE HARD MODEL, WHAT THE MODEL FORCES IT TO, BASED ON OUR ASSUMPTION, AND THIS IS SHOWING BASED ON SOME OF THE CHANGES THAT WE MADE HOW THOSE, THAT ENDING BALANCE WOULD BE IMPACTED OVER TIME. ALSO THE TARGET RESERVE, SEEING THAT IT'S COMING IN A LITTLE BIT LOWER THAN THE TARGET, BUT AGAIN, WE HAVE SOME ROOM IN OUR ASSUMPTIONS TO THINK ABOUT WHAT THAT LOOKS LIKE. SO WITH THAT, BEFORE I OPEN IT UP TO COMMISSIONERS TO START PLAYING IN THIS MODEL, DOES EVERYBODY UNDERSTAND WHAT WE ARE LOOKING AT ON THIS -- ON THE PROJECTION SCREEN? GIVE US ONE SECOND. ALL RIGHT. SO COMMISSIONERS, I'M STARTING US HERE TO GIVE US SOME IDEA. CAN WE GO BACK TO THE PLAN CHANGE SUMMARY TAB? COMMISSIONERS, WHAT ELSE WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE IN THIS SPACE? COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT. I GUESS I'M A LITTLE CONFUSED AT THIS POINT AND I APOLOGIZE FOR THAT. AT THE LAST MEETING YOU ASKED US TO SUBMIT OUR PLANS THAT WE MIGHT WANT TO SEE MODELED. I SUBMITTED THAT LAST WEEK. I DON'T SEE THAT PLAN MODELED ANYWHERE. >> WE CAN PULL IT UP. >> NO, I'M ASKING WHY, I MEAN, WHAT IS THE POINT OF ASKING US TO MODEL THESE PLANS WHEN I -- I WANTED TO SEE

THEM BEFORE TODAY. I WANTED ALL THE COMMISSIONERS TO SEE THOSE BEFORE TODAY. THAT WAS MY UNDERSTANDING THAT WHEN WE HAVE A QUESTION, WE SUBMIT IT TO COURTNEY, AND COURTNEY DOES THE WORK AND DOES WHAT WE ASK HER AND SUBMITS IT TO ALL. >> I UNDERSTAND, COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT AND PLEASE UNDERSTAND AND MAYBE THAT WAS A MISUNDERSTANDING. PART OF WHAT WE WERE TRYING TO DO IF THERE WERE PARTICULAR THINGS COMMISSIONERS WANTED TO SEE TO RUN THAT AND MODEL THAT SO THAT YOU WERE AWARE TO HELP BE INFORMED WITH THIS CONVERSATION. I DON'T KNOW THAT WE WERE TRYING TO PUSH ALL OF THOSE DIFFERENT THINGS OUT. WE HAVE THE PIECES OF THAT AND SO WE CAN CLEAR AND RUN SOME OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS THAT, OF THE PLAN THAT YOU HAD SENT IN. >> I THINK THAT'S NOT -- I DON'T THINK THAT WAS EFFICIENT, I DON'T THINK IT'S EFFICIENT AT ALL. >> I UNDERSTAND. WE ARE STILL WORKING THROUGH IT. >> I WOULD HAVE LIKED -- THE OTHER THING IS, I DON'T THINK WE CAN EVEN BEGIN TO HAVE THIS DISCUSSION UNTIL WE COME TO AN UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT WE WANT TO TARGETED RESERVE BALANCE TO BE. I KNOW THAT YOU DON'T -- I KNOW THAT I HAVE TALKED ABOUT THIS LAST TIME, AND I UNDERSTAND THAT THERE IS SOME RESISTANCE TO TALK ABOUT IT, BUT THE LEGISLATURE DID PASS HOUSE BILL 2218, AND SEGAL DID DO SOME ANALYSIS FOR US. >> THEY DID, SENT TO ALL COMMISSIONERS. >> THAT'S CORRECT, I HAVE IT IN MY PACKET. THERE IS A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THAT BUT REGARDLESS, WE NEED TO START, WE NEED TO KNOW WHAT WE WANT -- WE NEED TO COME TO A CONSENSUS ON WHAT WE WANT OUR RESERVE BALANCE TO BE. I BELIEVE THAT THE LEGISLATURE'S INTENT IS FOR US NOT TO BE SITTING HERE WITH \$80 MILLION OR \$70 MILLION OR WHATEVER. I ALSO THOUGHT THAT I HAD ASKED FOR PLAN Q TO BE, TO NOT BE PART OF THE PLAN. I WANTED TO ASK WHY WAS THE PLAN EVEN OFFERED FOUR YEARS AGO, MY UNDERSTANDING IT WAS NOT OFFERED UNTIL FOUR YEARS AGO. BUT I ALSO THINK THAT YOU KNOW, I WENT BACK -- TRYING TO FIND MY NOTES ON THAT RIGHT NOW. WELL, STATE EMPLOYEES

DIDN'T GET A RAISE, I KNOW I MENTIONED THAT MANY, MANY TIMES. >> PROPOSED, BUT NOT APPROVED BY THE LEGISLATURE. >> I UNDERSTAND WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THAT. BUT THE STATE, BUT IT DOES NOT CHANGE THE FACT. >> IT DOESN'T, WHICH IS WHY WE WANT TO ENSURE THAT ONE, THAT THIS PLAN IS STILL STRONG AND THAT IT IS STILL RICH FOR THEM. BUT ALSO THAT WE ALSO WANT TO AS WE LOOK AT IT MAKE SURE THAT AND IT'S ONE OF THE REASONS WHY JUST IN EARLY MODELLING TRYING TO MAKE SURE THAT WE ARE SELECTING THINGS OR CONSIDERING THINGS THAT HELP THE MONEY BACK IN POCKETS ON A DAY-TO-DAY, OVERALL, AS WELL AS KEEPING THE PLAN STRONG. COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT, I WOULD LIKE TO GO TO YOUR FIRST POINT BEFORE WE WALK DOWN A FEW OTHERS AROUND THE RESERVE. I DON'T THINK THAT THERE IS HESITANCY TO SPEAK ABOUT THE RESERVE AND I WOULD OPEN IT UP TO OTHER COMMISSIONERS. THE CURRENT RESERVE BASED ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS AND THE DATA IN AND AROUND FROM OUR ACTUARY BIDS, 13.5%, AT THE MOMENT BASED ON THE WORK THAT WE HAVE DONE TO UNDERSTAND AROUND OUR CLAIMS AND THOSE LEVELS. OUR INTERPRETATION, I BELIEVE, YOUR INTERPRETATION AND OUR TEAM'S INTERPRETATION OF WHAT THE LEGISLATIVE BILL SAYS I THINK MIGHT BE SLIGHTLY DIFFERENT IN THE SENSE THAT IT ASKS THE COMMISSION TO LOOK AT THE 10% MARK AND TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS AROUND THAT MARK. IT DOES NOT SAY THAT WE HAVE TO MOVE TO THAT BUT IT IS SOMETHING FOR US TO BE THINKING ABOUT AND CONSIDERING. IN THAT, RIGHT, RIGHT NOW OUR PLAN BASED ON THE DATA WE HAVE AND BASED ON OUR RECOMMENDATIONS, TWO FACTORS THAT CREATE THE CURRENT RESERVE BALANCE. IF SOMEBODY WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A MOTION, EITHER TO AFFIRM OR TO CHANGE THAT RESERVE BALANCE, I WILL ENTERTAIN THAT MOTION FOR DISCUSSION. >> THIS IS VICKI SCHMIDT. I DON'T WANT TO MAKE A MOTION RIGHT NOW, I WANT TO HAVE THE DISCUSSION. NOT READY TO MAKE A MOTION BUT I WANT TO HAVE THE DISCUSSION. BECAUSE THERE'S \$12 MILLION DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE SEGAL RESERVE

AND WHAT THE LEGISLATURE HAD -- >> INQUIRED OF. >> WHAT THE LEGISLATURE PUT IN STATUTE IN HOUSE BILL 2218. >> AND I WILL REFER TO LEGAL COUNSEL BECAUSE I DO WANT TO BE CLEAR AND I AM NOT TRYING TO DERAIL THE CONVERSATION IN THIS SPACE, BUT ONE OF THE THINGS THE HOUSE BILL DID NOT SAY THAT WE HAD TO MOVE TO A 10%, AND THEY ARE ASKING FOR THAT REPORT IN JANUARY, WHICH ALSO GIVES US MORE TIME TO UNDERSTAND AND THINK ABOUT THAT CONSIDERATION SO I WILL ASK THAT OUR LEGAL COUNSEL WALK THROUGH THE INTERPRETATION OF WHAT WE UNDERSTAND THAT HOUSE BILL TO DO IN TERMS OF OUR CONSIDERATION. >> JOHN -- OK. HOUSE BILL 2218 TOWARDS THE END OF IT, SECTION 3, YES, SECTION 3 SAYS K.S.A.756509, AMENDED TO READ AS FOLLOWS. COMMENCING WITH THE REGULAR SESSION OF THE LEGISLATURE IN 1985 AND WITH EACH REGULAR SESSION OF THE LEGISLATURE THEREAFTER, KANSAS STATE EMPLOYEES HEALTHCARE COMMISSION SHALL SUBMIT TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE AND THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE DAY THE GOVERNOR'S BUDGET REPORT IS SUBMITTED TO THE LEGISLATURE RECOMMENDATIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE STATE HEALTHCARE BENEFITS PROGRAM TOGETHER WITH ESTIMATES OF COSTS FOR THE PROGRAM PROPOSED BY THE COMMISSION, INCLUDING A FIVE-YEAR PROJECTION OF THE COSTS OF THE PROGRAM AND THE ESTIMATED COST OF ADMITTING EACH ENTITY PURSUANT TO K.S.A.756506C AND AMENDMENTS THERETO, AND NEW LANGUAGE, THE RECOMMENDATION SHALL INCLUDE A REPORT ON THE CURRENT AND PROJECTED RESERVE BALANCE, INCLUDING AS A PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL EXPENSES. FOR ANY RESERVE BALANCE OVER 10% OF THE AVERAGE PLAN EXPENSES FOR IMMEDIATELY PRECEDING THREE PLAN YEARS, THE COMMISSION SHALL PROVIDE RECOMMENDATIONS OF REDUCING RESERVES MINIMIZING EMPLOYEE CONTRIBUTIONS OR COST SHARING REQUIREMENTS, TOGETHER WITH THE RECOMMENDATIONS SUBMITTED THE COMMISSION SHALL INCLUDE ALTERNATIVES FOR COST AND BENEFIT COVERAGE FOR QUALIFIED PERSONS BOTH THE PROPOSED PROGRAM AND THE



FIVE-YEAR PROJECTED PROGRAM. THE COMMISSION SHALL ALSO  
SM IT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE STATE EMPLOYEE HEALTH  
BENEFITS PROGRAM. >> COMMISSIONERS, OTHER DISCUSSION  
AROUND THE RESERVE? >> VICKI SCHMIDT. I UNDERSTAND, AND  
I CAN READ THAT HOUSE BILL 2218 AND I KNOW THAT IT'S JUST A  
REPORT BUT I ALSO KNOW THAT THERE IS A LEGISLATIVE INTENT  
AND I UNDERSTAND THAT YOU KNOW, IF WE WANT TO PLAY WITH  
FIRE WE CAN, THAT'S FINE. YOU KNOW, MAYBE THE RIGHT THING  
TO DO IS TO PUT OFF MAKING THESE DECISIONS UNTIL AFTER  
OUR TWO NEW MEMBERS COME ON TO THE, COME ON TO THE  
COMMITTEE THAT ARE ACTUALLY, WERE ACTUALLY PART OF THE  
PEOPLE THAT VOTED FOR THE LEGISLATION. I DIDN'T LOOK AT  
THEIR VOTING RECORDS, I ASSUME BOTH OF THEM VOTED FOR  
THAT BUT I COULD BE MISTAKEN. BUT YOU KNOW, MAYBE -- AND  
THEN THEY COULD SPEAK TO THE LEGISLATIVE INTENT OF THAT.  
BUT I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT FOR US TO KNOW WHAT OUR  
TARGET FOR THE RESERVE BALANCE IS GOING TO BE, WITH OR  
WITHOUT THE 10%, AND WE DON'T KNOW THAT, WE HAVE NOT  
ESTABLISHED THAT BEFORE THAT. WHAT I DID WANT TO SAY  
THAT THANKS TO -- WELL, GOING BACK ON SOME OF THE  
INFORMATION WE HAVE LOOKED AT, ONE YEAR AGO WE WERE  
CONTEMPLATING, ONE YEAR AGO IN THESE CHAIRS IN JUNE, WE  
WERE CONTEMPLATING INCREASE OF 5.4% FOR EMPLOYEES AND  
EMPLOYERS. IT WAS ON THE DIVISION OF HEALTHCARE FINANCE  
PROJECTED RESERVE CALCULATION STATEMENT AS OF JULY OF  
2020. WITH THAT CHANGE, THE PROJECTED RESERVE AT THAT  
TIME WITH THOSE CHANGES, THAT PROJECTED RESERVE WAS  
GOING TO BE \$65 MILLION. SO THINK ABOUT -- ALL OF THOSE  
NUMBERS THAT ARE, WHATEVER, ON THE INCREASE WERE 5.4%  
ALL THE WAY DOWN THE LINE. WE DIDN'T DO THAT. WE  
INCREASED THE EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION BY 3%, INSTEAD OF  
5.4%. DIDN'T CHANGE THE EMPLOYEE AND EMPLOYEE PLUS  
CHILDREN, LEFT THAT AT 0, WE DECREASED THE EMPLOYEE PLUS  
SPOUSE AND EMPLOYEE PLUS FAMILY BY 2% AND DID THE SAME  
FOR THE NONMEDICARE RETIREE BY 2%. FISCAL YEAR 2021  
ENDING BALANCE IS PROJECTED AT OVER 69 MILLION CURRENTLY.

YOU KNOW, THAT -- AND YES, I KNOW WE HAD COVID, I'M VERY AWARE YOU ALL TELL ME IT'S AN UNUSUAL YEAR. BUT THOSE -- THOSE ESTIMATES, I MEAN, WE CLEARLY DID NOT FOLLOW ANYWHERE NEAR WHAT WAS PROJECTED BY SEGAL TO REACH THOSE ENDING BALANCES AND WE STILL SURPASSED THE ENDING BALANCES. AND YOU KNOW, I REAL -- I'M REALLY CONCERNED ABOUT THE WAY THAT WE ARE GOING ON INCREASING THE EMPLOYEE CONTRIBUTIONS. YOU EFFECTIVELY ARE GOING TO CUT THE EMPLOYEE TAKE HOME PAY BY -- YOU CAN SNICKER, BUT -- >> I'M NOT SNICKERING, COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT. >> AND WE HAVE NO INCREASES. SO I'LL JUST PUT IT OUT THERE RIGHT NOW, I'M NOT GOING TO SUPPORT A PLAN WHERE THE EMPLOYEE TAKES HOME LESS MONEY. >> UNDERSTANDABLE. SO, LET'S MODEL, COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT, LET'S THROW IN THE FACTOR THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO SEE IN RELATIONSHIP TO PLAN CHANGE SUMMARY, I'M SORRY, COMMISSIONER DECHANT. >> CAN WE GO BACK TO THE, I THINK IT'S THE ASSUMPTION SUMMARY, THE ONE THAT SHOWS THE OUT YEARS AND THE PERCENTAGES OF INCREASES PROJECTED TO SUPPORT CURRENT ASSUMPTIONS. BECAUSE I WANTED TO SEE THAT AS WELL. AS WE HAVE -- THIS IS WHAT WE MODELED. THAT'S WHAT I WANTED, THIS IS WHAT I WANTED. THIS IS WHAT WE HAVE MODELED, YES. JUST POINT OUT TO OURSELVES THAT AS WE DECREASE, AS WE TALK ABOUT MAKING THE CHANGES AND DECREASE THE CHANGE, DECREASE THE PERCENTAGES OF INCREASE TO THE EMPLOYER AND THE EMPLOYEE, WE THEN, USE THE PHRASE KICK THE CAN DOWN THE ROAD IN TERMS OF WHAT IT MAY, WHAT WE'LL BE FACED WITH IN OUT YEARS AND OF COURSE IF WE WENT BEYOND 24, IT WOULD CONTINUE THAT WAY. >> AND A LITTLE BIT AS WELL. AND AGAIN, HAVING THE, YOU KNOW, TO COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT'S POINT WHERE WE SIT IN THE RESERVE, THERE IS A RESERVE TARGET BALANCE BUT WE CAN AS A COMMISSION, AS WE ARE COMFORTABLE, YOU KNOW, KIND OF BRING THAT DOWN AND UTILIZE IN YEARS THAT WE FEEL TO HELP SMOOTH THAT, WHICH IS KIND OF WHAT WE WOULD BE DOING IF WE WERE TO MAKE, AS WE DID LAST YEAR, AND AS WE

MAKE CHANGES THIS YEAR. NOW, AGAIN, WHERE THAT SITS OR HOW MUCH IT WILL HELP -- REMEMBER, THIS MODEL HARD WIRES US BACK INTO OUR CURRENT ASSUMPTIONS AND CHANGING THOSE ASSUMPTIONS YOU CAN SEE, AND SO WHAT I WOULD ENCOURAGE US TO LOOK AT IS NOT NECESSARILY, JUST THE TARGET RESERVE BUT JUST LOOK AT OUR ENDING BALANCE AND UNDERSTANDING HOW THAT NUMBER CAN COME DOWN ACROSS THE NUMBER OF YEARS. COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT'S POINT, IF YOU DO LOOK AT THE LETTER THAT SEGAL PREPARED THAT DID SHOW IN RELATIONSHIP TO THE 10%, YOU CAN SEE WHAT THOSE NUMBERS ARE A REFLECTION OF, AND I'M NOT SURE WHERE IT IS IN THE PACKET, IF THE TEAM COULD KNOW OR LET US KNOW. >> UNDER THE FOLLOW-UP. >> THANK YOU. FOLLOW-UP PART OF THE PACKET. SO TO SAY THESE ARE ALL FACTORS A PART OF OUR DECISION-MAKING TO UNDERSTAND THAT. >> AND I UNDERSTAND. >> AT SOME POINT IN TIME WE PAID THE PIPER. AND I KNOW THAT WE CAN ADJUST WHAT WE ARE TARGETING AS OUR RESERVE BALANCE, I KNOW THAT. AND YET WE CAN -- IN MY OPINION, ONLY LOWER THAT SO MUCH BEFORE I THINK WE TAKE AN UNDUE RISK IN TERMS OF THE PLAN SOLVENCY AS EVENTS OCCUR THAT CAN AFFECT IT AND I RECALL ONE DISTINCTLY SEVERAL YEARS AGO. WE CAN'T GET AWAY IT'S GOING TO COST AT SOME POINT IN TIME TO MAINTAIN EVEN A MINIMAL BALANCE IN THE RESERVES TO HAVE A MINIMALLY VIABLE PLAN WITHOUT RECOGNIZING THAT AS WE LOWER THE INCOME, WE PUSH THE NEED FOR THAT INCOME INTO OUT YEARS. >> COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT. >> THANK YOU. VICKI SCHMIDT. I WOULD SAY YES, WE ARE KICKING THE CAN DOWN THE ROAD IF YOU WANT TO MAINTAIN THAT LARGE RESERVE BALANCE, AND I DON'T THINK THAT IS WHAT -- >> I THINK THAT IT WILL -- THE RESERVE BALANCE, WE CAN LOWER IT BY \$20 MILLION AND WE ARE STILL GOING TO FACE THESE KINDS OF THINGS. THEY ARE NOT GOING TO GO AWAY. THEY WON'T BE THAT HIGH, BUT THEY WON'T GO AWAY, AND WE JUST NEED TO RECOGNIZE. I DON'T KNOW IF WE CAN MAKE THE MODEL, IF WE CAN FORCE THE MODEL TO ACCEPT THE DIFFERENT RESERVE BALANCE DOWN THE ROAD, JUST TO SEE

WHAT IT DOES. BUT THE SAME KIND OF THINGS, I'M POSITIVE, WILL CONTINUE TO BE OUT THERE IF WE -- AND I'M NOT SAYING I'M OPPOSED AT ALL TO THE PERCENTAGES THAT WE ARE LOOKING AT RIGHT NOW. BUT WE'VE GOT TO RECOGNIZE WHAT WE HAVE TO DEAL WITH IN THE FUTURE. >> COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT, CAN WE PULL UP YOUR MODEL, OR DID YOU HAVE A DIFFERENT COMMENT, APOLOGY. >> I WON'T HARP ON THE RESERVE ANY LONGER BUT THE RESERVE IS, AS I JUST TOLD YOU A YEAR AGO WE MODELED IT AT 5.4%, AND THAT'S WHAT THE RECOMMENDATION WAS. WE CAME NOWHERE NEAR THAT 5.4%. WE DECREASED SOME PLANS, AND WE INCREASED WHAT THE EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION, THE STATE CONTRIBUTION BY ALMOST HALF OF WHAT, OF WHAT WAS RECOMMENDED, AND OUR RESERVE BALANCE STILL HELD AND MAINTAINED AND ACTUALLY INCREASED. AND THAT IS WHAT I THINK THE LEGISLATURE DOES NOT WANT TO HAPPEN. THEY WANT TO PUT THAT MONEY BACK INTO THE STATE EMPLOYEE'S HANDS AND THE GOVERNOR TALKS ABOUT SHE WANTS A HEALTHY KANSAS, SHE WANTS A GOOD WORKFORCE, SHE WANTS TO BE GOOD TO STATE EMPLOYEES. WELL, WE CAN BE GOOD TO STATE EMPLOYEES AND TAKE CARE OF THIS HERE. BUT I WILL -- I DO WANT AT SOME POINT MY MODEL TO GO UP. >> COMMISSIONER BROWN-GHOSTON. >> THIS IS COMMISSIONER BROWN-GHOSTON. I WOULD LIKE TO SEE IF WE CAN -- SEE WHAT THE MODELS LOOK LIKE WITH THE STATE'S RECOMMENDATION AT 10% BECAUSE IF I'M UNDERSTANDING THIS CORRECTLY, RIGHT NOW 13.5%. >> 13.5%, AND THAT IS BASED ON OUR CLAIMS TREND, OUR CURRENT CLAIMS, NOT CURRENT CLAIMS TREND, MULTIPLE YEAR CALCULATION OF OUR AVERAGES OF OUR CLAIMS TRENDS AND OUR 13.5 IS, IT'S A COMBINATION OF -- >> THROUGH MAY OF 2021, CORRECT? [INAUDIBLE] >> OK. SO, SO I'M UNDERSTANDING THEN HOW WE DERIVED AT THE 13.5%. BUT IF THE LEGISLATION IS RECOMMENDING THAT WE KEEP IT AT 10%, CAN WE AT LEAST EXPLORE IT TO AT LEAST SEE WHAT IT LOOKS LIKE? >> YES, SO, IN THE PACKET IT SHOWS THE NUMBERS THAT SEGAL IDENTIFIED. IT'S IN, CAN YOU GUYS FIND THE PAGE --

UNDER WHICH TAB? I THINK IT'S TAB 9 -- NO, TOO FAR BACK. WHAT'S THE PAGE? NOPE. IT'S FURTHER BACK. PAGE 131. IS THAT NOT IT? 131? 131, PAGE 131. >> CLARIFY SOMETHING? >> THE 10% AND 13.5% CANNOT BE COMPARED DIRECTLY BECAUSE THE 10% THAT THE LEGISLATURE PUT IN THAT PIECE, IN HOUSE BILL 2218 IS ALL EXPENSES. SO THAT'S INCLUDING THE CONTRACTS, THAT'S INCLUDING ALL OF THE EXPENSES. WHERE THE 13.5% IS NOT -- IS THE IBNR AND THE CLAIMS FLUCTUATION. THAT'S WHY SEGAL, THE DIFFERENCE IN THE NUMBERS ARE ABOUT, HANG ON, ABOUT \$12 MILLION. SO THE 10% WITH ALL -- WITH THE CONTRACTS FOR THE PBM AND THE TPA AND THE VISION, ALL -- THAT ISN'T A GOOD ONE, BUT ALL OF THE OTHER CONTRACTS THAT WE EYE PROVED FOR THE SEGAL CONTRACTS, ALL OF THOSE THINGS. IT'S 10%, INCLUDING, SO IT'S TOTAL EXPENSES OF THE PLAN, NOT JUST THE CLAIMS EXPENSES AND THE 13.5% IS BASED ON CLAIMS EXPERIENCE ONLY. IF SEGAL DISAGREES WITH THAT, LET ME KNOW. >> NO, THAT'S RIGHT, YOU ARE RIGHT. >> I DON'T WANT TO -- I DON'T WANT ANYBODY TO THINK IT'S A 3.5% DIFFERENCE. >> NO, IT'S NOT. >> CORRECT. >> KEEP SAYING 13.5, BUT IT'S 13. >> 13, I'M SORRY. MY APOLOGIES. >> THE OTHER THING IS, IT'S THE TIME PERIOD, TOO, SO THE BILL LOOKS BACK AT THE LAST THREE YEARS, IT'S AN AVERAGE, AND THE WAY THE CLAIMS PIECE, JUST THE EXPECTED CLAIMS FOR THE GIVEN YEAR, SO IT'S A LITTLE DIFFERENT ON THE MEASUREMENT. SO, THAT'S ALL OUTLINED IN THE LETTER. >> AND I THINK FROM KIND OF A PERSPECTIVE, TO REACH INTO AND UTILIZE SOME OF THAT RESERVE. I THINK SOME OF MY HESITATION IS NOT NECESSARILY AROUND IT HAVING TO CHANGE, BUT BEING CAREFUL AND MAKING SURE WE ARE UNDERSTANDING AND NOT MAKING DEEP CUTS THAT AS WE LOOK AND UNDERSTAND KIND OF LONG-TERM IN THE PLAN, I THINK THAT THERE'S WAYS THAT WE CAN GET THERE GRADUALLY AND TO HAVE A BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF LOOKING AT THAT WITHOUT IT BEING DEEP AND SWIFT RIGHT NOW BUT DIPPING A LITTLE DEEPER. EVEN WITH THE ADJUSTMENTS WE MAKE THIS YEAR, THE MODELLING SHOWS US THE IMPACT AS IT HAPPENS IN THE NEXT YEAR OR 2

DOWN THE ROAD AND WE CAN CONTINUE TO SMOOTH THAT, BUT IT SHOWS US HOW WE CAN DIP INTO OR GO BELOW WHAT THE CURRENT PROJECTED RESERVE IS, AND THE MODEL WILL SHOW YOU KIND OF WHAT THAT DIFFERENT DOLLAR AMOUNT IS THAT WE ARE KIND OF DRAWING THAT RESERVE DOWN TO AS IT WAS JUST BUILT AS A TOOL RIGHT NOW. SO I THINK DEFINITELY THERE IS SOME ROOM THERE. I AM JUST A LITTLE BIT MORE RISK ADVERSE IN MOVING THROUGH A CHUNK OF THAT AMOUNT AT THIS TIME. THAT'S JUST MY PERSPECTIVE. COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT. CAN WE GET THE MODELLING TOOL BACK UP? THANK YOU. >> CAN I CHANGE THE CONVERSATION JUST QUICKLY? >> SURE. >> ABOUT THEN IF WE GO WITH WHAT -- WHAT YOU HAVE SUGGESTED, AND YOU ARE MORE RISK AVERSE THAN THE LEGISLATURE, CAN WE TALK ABOUT THE EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION? BECAUSE SOME FUN FACTS TO ME, MAYBE NOT FUN FACTS TO EVERYBODY ELSE, BUT I CALLED THE LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH THIS MORNING AND TALKED TO THE J.G. SCOTT, THE HEAD OF LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH. FISCAL YEAR 2021, ENDING BALANCE FOR THE STATE AS OF 5/31, NOT CURRENT, BUT 5/31 WAS \$1.7 BILLION. IN THE MONTH OF JUNE, CORPORATE TAXES 47 MONTHLY AND AS OF TODAY, 94 MILLION. SO, 94 MILLION, WELL, 47 MILLION IN EXCESS. AS OF 5/31/2021, WITHOUT THE EXTRA DOLLARS RECEIVED IN JUNE OF 2021, ENDING BALANCE IS PROJECTED IN FISCAL YEAR OF 2022 AT 1.14 BILLION. THE REASON I TELL YOU THOSE THINGS, FOR EVERY 1% INCREASE THAT WE DO IN THE EMPLOYER, IN THE STATE CONTRIBUTION TO THE STATE EMPLOYEE HEALTH PLAN IS ABOUT \$3 MILLION TO THE COST OF \$3 MILLION TO THE S.G.F. \$3 MILLION, MY CALCULATOR HAD A HARD TIME, BUT IF I TAKE THE \$3 MILLION OF THE \$1.7 BILLION, IT IS 0.17%. SO, LESS THAN 1/5 OF 1% OF THE MONEY THAT THE STATE IS, IN OVER ESTIMATES FROM 5/31. AND THE TEN-YEAR HISTORY, TIMES THE EMPLOYER, THE STATE OF KANSAS DECREASED IN THE TEN-YEAR INFORMATION WE GOT IN THE PACKET, THE STATE DECREASED THEIR CONTRIBUTION ALL THE WHILE WHILE INCREASING THE EMPLOYEE AND THE EMPLOYEE SPOUSE, AND EMPLOYEE FAMILY, INCREASING THEIR

PERCENTAGES. I WAS NOT ON THE COMMISSION AT THE TIME BUT I'M JUST SAYING IT IS TIME FOR THE STATE TO INCREASE THEIR CONTRIBUTIONS IN THIS PLAN, AND IT JUST -- I'M NOT ASKING FOR A 10% INCREASE, I COULD. BECAUSE I THINK WE HAVE THE MONEY TO DO THAT. BUT IF WE ARE AVERSE TO -- IF PEOPLE ON THIS COMMITTEE ARE AVERSE TO DECREASING THE TARGET OR THE ENDING BALANCE, THEN I STILL DON'T THINK THE EMPLOYEES OUGHT TO TAKE IT. IT OUGHT TO BE THE STATE. THANK YOU. >> ONE OTHER THINGS I THINK COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT, YOU KNOW, WE TALK A LOT AND I KNOW THAT AS YOU LOOK ACROSS YOU LOOKED ACROSS THE HISTORY AND BROUGHT THAT UP AND KIND OF HISTORY TO MAKE SURE THAT EVERY COMMISSIONER HAD THE BACKGROUND AS WELL. ONE OF THE THINGS, OVER THE LAST FEW YEARS WE HAVE IN SOME YEARS, YOU KNOW, AS AGGRESSIVELY AS WE BELIEVE THAT WE COULD PUSH IN FOR THE STATE, I THINK THIS YEAR WE HAVE A LITTLE BIT MORE ROOM. I WOULD DISAGREE WITH YOU THAT 10% IS SOMEPLACE THAT WE COULD LAND, BUT I ALSO THINK THAT WHAT WE HAVE TRIED TO DO OVER THE LAST FEW YEARS IS TO DO THAT, TOO, IF YOU LOOK COMPARATIVELY PRIOR TO THAT, TO CONTINUE TO TRY TO ENSURE THAT THERE IS ONE, A STATE CONTRIBUTION, AND THAT THAT IS -- THAT IS DEFINITELY HIGHER THAN THE EMPLOYEE CONTRIBUTION AND SUBSEQUENTLY THE EMPLOYEE CONTRIBUTION OVER THE LAST TWO YEARS, TRIED TO MINIMIZE THAT IMPACT. ONE OF THE PLACES THAT I STARTED HERE WAS SETTING THE STATE AT ABOUT A 4.3. THE HARD MODEL FORCED IT TO A 4.7. I WAS GIVING US JUST A STARTING PLACE, BUT ALSO WITH THE EMPLOYEE CONTRIBUTION AS THE E.A.C. HAD MENTIONED IS ONE OF THE THINGS THAT WHILE LIKE THE OUT OF POCKET WAS VERY IMPORTANT TO THEM AS WELL AS KIND OF SOME OF THE OTHER FACTORS, BUT ALSO RECOGNIZED THAT THE SMALL INCREMENTAL INCREASES IN THE CONTRIBUTION OVER TIME WERE MUCH MORE WELCOMED, PREFERRED TO HAVE THAN LIKE SHARP INCREASES THAT HAD HAPPENED IN THE PAST. SO, THIS IS A STARTING POINT, LIKE PLEASE KNOW THIS IS NOT AN ENDING POINT AND TRYING TO GET US TO LOOK AT OK, HERE ARE

SOME INCREMENTAL INCREASES IN WHAT WE COULD DO, AS WELL AS THE STARTING POINT FOR THE STATE TO SEE IF WE CAN, YOU KNOW, WHAT THAT LOOKS LIKE, AND SHOWING US WHAT THAT IMPACT WOULD BE. AND SO AGAIN, EVEN WITH THE MODELLING WE JUST PUT UP AS A STARTING POINT, IT DOES SHOW US TAKING DOWN THE RESERVE A BIT IF WE GO BACK TO THAT TAB TO A LITTLE BIT BELOW WHAT THE CURRENT TARGET IS, SO, AND THAT'S WHY I REPEAT THAT I THINK THERE IS DEFINITELY SOME ROOM THERE AS WE LOOK ACROSS THAT, WOULD GIVE US THE ABILITY TO CHANGE NUMBERS, UP, DOWN, AND WHATEVER DIRECTION, AND TO MANIPULATE SOME OF THE ITEMS IN TERMS OF THE PLAN DESIGN TO CONTINUE TO STRENGTHEN IT. MAYBE IT'S A BIGGER OUT OF POCKET AS WELL, OR A LARGER DEDUCTION TO BE OUT OF POCKET, LET ME SAY THAT CORRECTLY. YOU KNOW, THAT ALSO HELPS TO BE IMPACTFUL AS THAT WAS ONE OF THE KEY AREAS THAT THE E.A.C. HAD BROUGHT UP. SO -- OTHER COMMISSIONERS, QUESTIONS, COMMENTS, I'M LOOKING AROUND. OK. CAN WE PULL UP THE MODELLING THAT COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT HAD REQUESTED? I KNOW THERE'S ONE ASPECT THAT'S A LITTLE OFF ON THIS MODEL, BUT WE CAN -- WE KNOW HOW TO ADJUST IT ACCORDINGLY, SO -- I THINK IF WE GO TO THE PLAN CHANGE SUMMARY. GIVE US JUST A MINUTE. >> DO YOU WANT ME TO READ WHAT I SUGGESTED OR WHAT I ASKED TO BE? >> I THINK THE TEAM HAS IT, BUT YOU ARE WELCOME TO. >> GO AHEAD IF THEY HAVE IT. >> WE DID HAVE SEGAL CALCULATE WHAT THE IMPACT WOULD BE. >> I DON'T WANT THAT DONE, IF THAT -- I DON'T WANT TO MESS UP WITH THE -- WITH THE REQUIREMENTS, I DON'T WANT TO MESS THAT UP. >> OK. >> BUT I DID HAVE -- REDUCED THE OUT OF POCKET, ANYWAY. >> OUT OF POCKET, PLAN A, OUT OF POCKET IN I BELIEVE THE REDUCTION WAS FOR THE 1,000/2 THOUSAND. >> CORRECT. AND PLAN C, REDUCE OUT OF POCKET 5,000/10 THOUSAND. >> THE WAY THIS ONE IS MODELED IS HIGHER AT THE 1,000/2 THOUSAND, THE 1,000/2 THOUSAND DEDUCTION, SO YOURS WOULD BE HALF OF THAT. AND SO WHEN WE GET TO THE END, WE CAN ACTUALLY KIND OF CALCULATE. YEP. >> OK. THEN I



HAVE ON THE -- ON THE ASSUMPTIONS FOR THE EMPLOYEES. >> NONE OF THE OTHER -- DID YOU HAVE ANY -- I APOLOGIZE, COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT. DID YOU HAVE ANY OTHER OF THE OUT OF POCKETS FOR THE OTHER PLANS? >> I DID NOT. >> OK. >> KIND OF WISH I WOULD HAVE. BUT KIND OF THOUGHT I WAS GOING TO GET IT AHEAD OF TIME SO I COULD PLAY WITH IT AGAIN. I DID NOT IN THIS SCENARIO I ASKED TO BE MODELED. THE -- THE EMPLOYEES DECREASE EVERYTHING BY 2% FOR ALL THE EMPLOYEES, ALL CATEGORIES. AND ON THE EMPLOYER INCREASE IT 3% ACROSS THE BOARD. PRETTY SIMPLE. >> ALL RIGHT. CAN WE -- SO, IT SHOWS THE OUT YEAR, 9.6, BUT WE HAVE THE ABILITY TO SMOOTH THAT, AND THE HARD WIRE DESIGN OF OUR CURRENT RESERVE BALANCE. IF WE GO TO PROJECTED SUMMARY, SO WHAT WE SEE IN COMPARISON TO THE ORIGINAL MODEL, SO IF WE LOOK AT THE ENDING BALANCE WITH THE ORIGINAL MODEL, 65 FOR THE UPCOMING YEAR, DIPPED INTO THE RESERVE USING ABOUT 1.8 IN THE PROJECTED YEAR. BY 23, AND UNDERSTANDING THAT THE TARGET RESERVE, THAT'S JUST SHOWING YOU THE DIFFERENCE. BUT LOOK AT THE ENDING BALANCE, PUTS THE ENDING BALANCE AT 46.8 THERE. AND WITH USING ABOUT 10 MILLION OUT OF THAT BALANCE, AGAIN, THE WAY THIS ONE IS HARD WIRED A SHORTFALL OF 10. BUT THIS IS THE SPACE WE HAVE THE ABILITY TO AGAIN MAKE OUR, YOU KNOW, HOW FAR DO WE WANT TO MOVE INTO THAT RESERVE AND HOW MUCH DO WE WANT TO UTILIZE. SO, AND AGAIN, REMEMBER, IT'S A MODEL, SO IT FORCES IT BACK, THAT'S WHY THE 9%, 9.7, 9.7 IS CALCULATED ON THE FRONT ONE BUT WE CAN SMOOTH THAT. THE ONLY THING I WANT TO STRESS TO THE COMMISSIONERS, SO IT'S NOT THAT IT'S GOING TO AUTOMATICALLY MOVE TO 9 IF WE ADJUST ASSUMPTION, THE FUTURE OUT YEARS COULD BE A SMALLER INCREASE FOR THE EMPLOYEE AND/OR THE EMPLOYER BECAUSE WE WOULD NOT BE FORCING THAT TO A TARGET RESERVE THAT THIS MODEL FORCES US BACK TO. COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT. >> THANK YOU, MADAM CHAIR. VICKI SCHMIDT. SO I GUESS I WOULD HAVE LIKED TO HAVE SEEN IS LIKE LAST YEAR WHEN WE WERE ASKED TO

INCREASE IT BY WHATEVER PERCENT THAT WAS, 5 SOMETHING ACROSS THE BOARD, WE ARE NOWHERE NEAR WHAT THAT FORCED IT TO. BECAUSE LIKE YOU SAY, THE ENDING BALANCES, THOSE TARGET RESERVES ARE HARD WIRED IN THERE AND THAT MODEL DID NOT, CAME NOWHERE CLOSE TO MEETING WHAT WAS PROJECTED A YEAR AGO. JUST A YEAR AGO. >> STEVE DECHANT. YOU HAVE -- DISCOUNTED COVID, WE MADE A \$25 MILLION GAIN LAST YEAR BASED ON THE EXTREME UNDER UTILIZATION OF SERVICES BECAUSE OF THE EXTRAORDINARY EVENT. THAT'S WHERE THE SAVINGS CAME FROM. I DON'T KNOW THAT ANY COMPANY, BEST OF MY UNDERSTANDING, ANY COMPANY COULD HAVE PROJECTED THE IMPACT IN ADVANCE -- COULD HAVE PROJECTED THAT COVID WAS GOING TO HAPPEN, MUCH LESS PROJECT WHAT IMPACT IT WAS GOING TO HAVE. AND I THINK WE ARE STILL TOO CLOSE TO IT TO EXPECT THAT WE ARE GOING TO CONTINUE CARRYING THE 25 MILLION, I THINK I HAVE THE RIGHT NUMBER, FORWARD, UNTIL WE ARE AT LEAST THROUGH THIS YEAR AND MAYBE WELL INTO NEXT YEAR TO SEE WHERE THIS WHOLE LAST YEAR TO YEAR AND A HALF SHAKES OUT OVER A PERIOD OF TIME. >> MADAM CHAIR. >> COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT. >> THEN GO BACK TO THE ASSUMPTION SUMMARY AND INCREASE THE PERCENTAGE THE STATE IS GOING TO PUT IN BECAUSE I DECREASE WHAT THE STATE -- PUT THE STATE AT 5% ACROSS THE BOARD. >> COMMISSIONERS, WHAT YOU SEE AGAIN, SO, IF WE ARE LOOKING AT IT, REMEMBER THIS IS YOUR -- THE ENDING BALANCE SO YOU CAN SEE UTILIZATION OF THAT ENDING BALANCE ACROSS THOSE TWO YEARS. AND SO WITH US BEING AGAIN DIPPING BELOW THAT TARGETED RESERVE, BUT AGAIN IN THE SPACE THAT IF WE ARE COMFORTABLE, VERY VIABLE. TURNING AROUND TO LOOK AT MY COMMISSIONERS. QUESTIONS, OTHER THOUGHTS? CAN WE GO BACK TO THE PLAN CHANGE SUMMARY TAB? ARE THERE OTHER THINGS COMMISSIONERS WOULD LIKE TO SEE FACTORED INTO COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT'S MODEL? >> MADAM CHAIR, NEGLI -- >> CO-INSURANCE FOR THE PREFERRED AND NONPREFERRED BRAND. >> CAN YOU EXCLUDE PLAN Q OR IS IT NEGLIGIBLE FOR

THAT IF WE WERE TO NOT OFFER PLAN Q, VICKI SCHMIDT, SORRY. WOULD IT BE NEGLIGIBLE TO NOT OFFER PLAN Q? >> I THINK IT'S NEGLIGIBLE BECAUSE WITH THE IDEA THAT THEY WILL, THE -- >> IT WOULD GO TO J OR N. >> GO TO OTHER PLANS AND BE DISPERSED ACCORDINGLY, AND BECAUSE OF THE CHANGES DOLLAR-WISE ARE NEGLIGIBLE, IT WOULD INCREASE IN THOSE -- >> BUT THAT IS AGAIN IN TERMS OF A RECOMMENDATION, IF IT'S SOMETHING WE WANT TO CONSIDER, WE'LL GET A FORMAL RECOMMENDATION THAT WE CAN. >> RIGHT, THANK YOU. >> DID WE GET ALL THE CO-INSURANCE BRAND DRUGS? >> YES, MA'AM. >> I'M GOING TO ASK -- LET ME SAY IT THIS WAY. I WOULD LIKE TO SEE A REDUCTION IN THE CO-PAYS IN PLAN A, ALSO PUT IN THERE, IT'S SOMETHING THAT AGAIN IT'S NOT A HUGE DOLLAR AMOUNT BUT I KNOW THAT IT DOES IMPACT THOSE WITH CHILDREN AND FAMILIES. IF YOU ARE SINGLE AND IN CERTAIN AGE GROUPS YOU MAY NOT HAVE VERY MANY CO-PAYS IN A GIVEN YEAR BUT A FAMILY AND MULTIPLE PEOPLE THE CO-PAYS CAN ADD UP QUICKLY IN SOME OF THOSE VISITS THAT ARE NOT AUTOMATICALLY COVERED. SO, JUST AGAIN THINKING ABOUT DOLLARS IN THE POCKET. SO, CAN WE GO BACK TO THE ASSUMPTION SUMMARY? OK. SO, RIGHT NOW OF THIS SITS AT 5 FOR THE STATE AND MINUS 2 FOR EMPLOYEES ACROSS ALL OF THE BUCKETS. CAN WE BALANCE THIS AND THEN I WANT TO COME BACK AND SEE SOMETHING SLIGHTLY DIFFERENT ON THIS ONE. SO -- THAT BALANCE, YOU SEE THAT COMMISSIONERS, SO YOU SEE WHAT THAT PROJECTION IS. AGAIN, IT'S PULLING IT BECAUSE WE ARE SPENDING MORE MONEY ON THE PLAN CHANGE SUMMARY, SO GO TO THE PROJECTION SUMMARY. ALL RIGHT. SO IF ANYBODY REMEMBERS A MINUTE AGO IN OUT YEAR 2023, BASED ON THIS MODEL, SO WE ARE DIPPING A MINUTE AGO BEFORE WE ADDED THOSE FEW THINGS, WE WERE COMING, USING ABOUT 4 MILLION INTO THAT TARGET RESERVE BRINGING IT ABOUT 4 MILLION LOWER WITH THE CHANGES WE JUST MADE, LOOKS LIKE IT'S COMING IN AROUND 6 MILLION LOWER THAN THE TARGET RESERVE. AGAIN, EVERYBODY SEE WHERE I'M SHOWING? JUST TO GIVE US A COMPARISON BY ADDING THOSE FEW THINGS, WE ARE

DIPPING A LITTLE BIT MORE INTO THAT RESERVE. 23, YES, IN 23. I'M TRYING TO SHOW THAT CONTINUOUS IMPACT. FOR 22, IF I REMEMBER CORRECTLY, WE HAD A SURPLUS OF A LITTLE OVER A MILLION, NOW THE SURPLUS IS ABOUT HALF OF THAT, ABOUT 500,000, RIGHT? OK. CAN WE GO BACK TO THE ASSUMPTION SUMMARY? SORRY, APOLOGIZE, COMMISSIONERS. PROJECTION SUMMARY QUICK. ANY QUESTIONS, I'M GOING TO ASK FOR A QUICK CHANGE. I WANT TO MAKE SURE BEFORE WE COME OFF OF THIS ONE. COMMISSIONER DECHANT, WHERE DO YOU WANT TO GO? >> GO BACK TO THE PROJECTION SUMMARY, I WOULD LIKE TO SEE THE EMPLOYEE PERCENTAGE 0. >> AT 0. >> UH-HUH, RATHER THAN -2. >> WE WERE OF THE SAME MIND, THAT'S WHAT I WAS GOING TO ASK. CAN WE REBALANCE THAT? AND THEN CAN YOU TAKE US TO THE PROJECTION SUMMARY? OK. COMMISSIONERS, WE ARE SEEING AGAIN LOOKING AT OUT YEARS, AGAIN DIPPING INTO THE FUND, THE TARGET RESERVE BY 2023 ABOUT 4 MILLION AND HAVING PROJECTED SURPLUS IN 2022 OF ABOUT 2.2. QUESTIONS BEFORE WE TWEAK ANOTHER ASPECT? GO BACK TO THE PLAN CHANGE SUMMARY? COMMISSIONERS, ARE THERE ANY OTHER ITEMS ON THE PLAN CHANGE SUMMARY THAT A COMMISSIONER WOULD LIKE MODELED OR INCORPORATED? THIS IS COMMISSIONER BROWN-GHOSTON. I WOULD LIKE TO SEE IN PLAN A A REDUCTION IN THE DEDUCTIBLE TO THE 900. >> ALONG WITH THE REST OF THE CHANGE, COMMISSIONER? >> YES, YES, HOLDING. IN ADDITION, CORRECT. >> ALL RIGHT. GO BACK TO THE SUMMARY, AND ARE WE -- ARE YOU ASKING TO LEAVE THE ASSUMPTION SUMMARY THE SAME? >> YES, LEAVE THE ASSUMPTION SUMMARY THE SAME. >> ALL RIGHT. ALL RIGHT. REBALANCE. A SLIGHT DIFFERENCE. ONE OF THE THINGS COMMISSIONERS WHEN YOU SEE THE PLAN CHANGE SUMMARY IT CAN SHOW YOU THE DOLLAR AMOUNT OF IMPACT SO TO KIND OF HELP US SEE IT IN MULTIPLE WAYS. GO BACK TO THE PROJECTION SUMMARY FOR US. AGAIN, IT GOES UP A LITTLE BIT, IT BRINGS DOWN THE PROJECTED SURPLUS A LITTLE. TAKES THE AMOUNT THAT WE UTILIZE OF THE PROJECTION RESERVES A LITTLE HIGHER, A LITTLE OVER 5 MILLION, BRINGING DOWN THAT

PROJECTED BALANCE IN 2022 TO 1.3. AND AGAIN, FOR ME WHEN I DID THE VERY, MY FIRST TRY AT THE MODELLING, ONE OF THE REASONS I DID NOT INCLUDE THE DEDUCTIBLE CHANGE WAS BECAUSE WE HAD JUST MADE A CHANGE TO THE DEDUCTIBLES FOR PLAN A LAST YEAR AND WANTING TO LET THAT KIND OF RUN ITS COURSE. BUT IF YOU REMEMBER, WE REDUCED, WE TOOK A TIER OFF, WE WENT FROM, LET ME REPHRASE IT. IT WAS NOT NECESSARILY A REDUCTION IN THE DOLLAR AMOUNT BUT WE CHANGED THE STRUCTURE THAT BECAUSE IT WAS A THREE-TIERED STRUCTURE AND MOVED IT BACK TO A TWO-TIERED STRUCTURE, SO 1,000, 2,000, AND \$3,000 STRUCTURE, AND WE REMOVED THE 3,000 LAST YEAR BUT IT IS ONE OF THOSE AREAS THAT IS OF CONTINUED, AND ALWAYS OF INTEREST TO EMPLOYEES. IT IS THE ONLY PLAN WHERE WE ARE ABLE TO MAKE A DEDUCTION CHANGE, HOWEVER, BECAUSE OF THE OTHER ONES BY FEDERAL REGULATIONS WE CAN'T CHANGE, THEY ARE AT THEIR LOWEST DEDUCTIBLE. SO -- JUST MAKING SURE WE ARE GIVING THE BACKGROUND. OTHER THOUGHTS, QUESTIONS? >> STILL EXPRESS MY CONCERN ABOUT THE OUT YEARS, AND I HEARD YOUR LEVELLING, I UNDERSTAND THAT. YOU MIGHT RECALL OUR EARLIER DISCUSSION OF, I FORGET HOW LONG AGO, I WAS UNCOMFORTABLE GOING DOWN TO THE THREE-YEAR PROJECTION. REALLY WANTED TO HAVE A FIVE. BECAUSE I THINK A FIVE WOULD SHOW US THE LEVELLING OR WHAT IT MIGHT TAKE AND I UNDERSTAND FROM THE PROJECTIONS, THE FURTHER OUT YOU GO THE LESS REALISTIC IT IS, TOO MUCH CAN HAPPEN. BUT IT DOES AT LEAST MODEL THAT, SO I STILL HAVE AN UNCOMFORTABILITY TO GET TO THE 23 WHERE REALLY WE ARE RIGHT ON TARGET WITH, LOOKING AT THIS, TARGET RESERVE AND BASELINE. IT STILL TAKES 7.9% TO GET THERE, AND IF WE BUFFER THAT, I MEAN, WE JUST -- AGAIN, I'LL SAY IT AGAIN, WE KEEP KICKING THE CAN DOWN THE ROAD. WE CAN'T CONTINUE FOREVER, NOT EVEN FOREVER, FOR 5 OR 10 YEARS TO UNDERFUND BECAUSE IT WILL BITE US AT SOME POINT AND WE EITHER THEN HAVE TO DECREASE BENEFITS OR INCREASE COSTS, INCREASE THE FEES THAT THE MEMBERS PAY. THE MEMBERS OF

THE STATE. IT JUST -- IT WILL BE THERE, THAT'S ALL THERE IS TO IT. >> COMMISSIONERS. QUESTIONS, COMMENTS?

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT. >> THANK YOU, MADAM CHAIR, VICKI SCHMIDT. CAN WE GO BACK TO THE ASSUMPTION SUMMARY AND YOU KNOW, I HAVE THE TEN-YEAR HISTORY HERE FROM 16, 17, 18 AND 19, WE RAISED THE EMPLOYEE PLUS SPOUSE AND EMPLOYEES PLUS FAMILY BY 106%. COULD WE AT LEAST PUT THE EMPLOYEE PLUS SPOUSE AND PLUS FAMILY, MINUS 2% IN THERE? >> CAN WE AT THAT TO THE MODEL? >> YEAH, PLEASE. GO OUT TO THE RETIREES? >> I BEG YOUR PARDON? >> THE CALCULATION IS NEGLIGIBLE, NOT THE PEOPLE, NOT THE PEOPLE. IT DOES NOT AFFECT YOU. >> CAN YOU TAKE US TO THE PROJECTION SUMMARY? SORRY. OK. SO WE HAVE COMMISSIONERS, AS WE ARE LOOKING AGAIN, BROUGHT DOWN A PROJECTED -- PROJECTED SURPLUS IN 22, DOWN TO JUST UNDER 300,000, AND CREEPING INTO ABOUT 6.5 OF A REDUCTION TO THE TARGET RESERVE, AGAIN STILL GIVING US SOME CUSHION AND ROOM. >> MADAM CHAIR. >> SORRY. >> I'M SORRY. >> NO, NO, IT WAS ME. COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT. >> I'LL MOVE THIS OFF THE CENTER HERE, I WOULD MAKE A MOTION TO ADOPT THIS PLAN. >> OK. >> AS IS. >> THERE IS A MOTION ON THE FLOOR TO ADOPT THE PLAN AS IS. BEFORE I TAKE A SECOND, CAN I ASK US TO FLIP THROUGH THE TAB JUST SO EVERYBODY REMEMBERS WHAT -- YES. THANK YOU. >> HOLD ON. >> I'M TRYING TO LOOK SIDeways AND USE A MICROPHONE, PLEASE BEAR WITH ME. >> YOU WANT ME TO MAKE THE MOTION OF EXACTLY WHAT IT DOES? OK. I WOULD MOVE TO INCREASE THE EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION ACROSS THE BOARD BY 5%, TO LEAVE THE EMPLOYEE CONTRIBUTION WHERE IT IS NOW, DECREASE THE EMPLOYEE AND SPOUSE CONTRIBUTION BY 2%, LEAVE THE EMPLOYEE AND CHILDREN WHERE THEY ARE NOW, DECREASE THE EMPLOYEE AND FAMILY BY 2%, DECREASE THE NONMEDICARE RETIREE EMPLOYEE PLUS SPOUSE BY 2%, DECREASE THE NONMEDICARE RETIREE EMPLOYEE PLUS FAMILY BY 2% AND LEAVE THE NONMEDICARE RETIREE EMPLOYEE AND EMPLOYEE PLUS CHILDREN 0. AND PLAN CHANGE SUMMARY. REDUCE ON PLAN A, REDUCE THE DEDUCTIBLE

TO \$901,000. I WOULD REDUCE THE CO-PAY FOR PRIMARY CARE PHYSICIAN FROM \$40 TO \$30. I WOULD REDUCE THE OUT OF POCKET MAXIMUM FROM 6250 FOR SINGLE AND 12,500, TO 5,250 FOR A SINGLE, AND 10,500 FOR A FAMILY. REDUCE THE CO-INSURANCE ON PREFERRED BRAND DRUGS, FROM 40 TO 35%. REDUCE CO-INSURANCE ON NONPREFERRED BRAND DRUGS, FROM 65 TO 60%. UNDER PLAN C, DECREASE THE OUT OF POCKET FROM 5500 FOR A SINGLE AND 11,000 FOR A FAMILY TO 4,500 FOR A SINGLE AND 9,000 FOR A FAMILY. WOULD MAKE THE SAME ADJUSTMENTS IN THE PREFERRED BRAND DRUGS AND THE NONPREFERRED BRAND DRUGS AS WE DID IN PLAN A. I WOULD REDUCE THE CO-INSURANCE AND PLAN J, REDUCE, DO THE SAME THING ON THE DRUG COVERAGES, SAME THING ON PLAN N AND I WOULD ELIMINATE PLAN Q FROM BEING OFFERED. >> COMMISSIONERS HAVE HEARD THE MOTION ON THE FLOOR. IS THERE A SECOND? SUMMARY PAGE, I'M SORRY, PROJECTION SUMMARY OR ASSUMPTION SUMMARY? >> PROJECTION SUMMARY. >> PROJECTION SUMMARY. COMMISSIONERS, THERE IS A MOTION ON THE FLOOR. WE NEED A SECOND AND THEN WE CAN MOVE INTO DISCUSSION. IS THERE A SECOND? >> I SECOND. >> COMMISSIONER BROWN-GHOSTON. >> COMMISSIONER BROWN-GHOSTON. THERE IS A SECOND, AND SO NOW COMMISSIONER BROWN-GHOSTON HAS ASKED US TO GO BACK TO THE PROJECTION SUMMARY TAB, CORRECT? >> YES. >> OK. >> COMMISSIONER, THE COMMISSIONERS, THE MOTION IS ON THE FLOOR AND OPEN FOR DISCUSSION. >> I WOULD LIKE FOR US BEFORE THE YEAR IS OUT TO TAKE THE MODEL AND PROJECT OUT THOSE PERCENTAGE INCREASES THAT ARE PROJECTED, TO BE ABLE TO SEE THOSE. I CONTINUE TO HAVE AN UNCOMFORTABILITY LOOKING AT TWO YEARS, I KNOW WHAT THE MODEL DOES, IT COMPRESSES IT AND MAKES IT ALL HAPPEN. I KNOW WE DON'T HAVE TO DO THAT, BUT, WELL I DON'T NEED TO RESTATE. I HAVE A LEVEL OF UNCOMFORTABILITY. >> ON YOUR MOTION, YOU SAY THE MODEL, 1900 -- I THINK IT'S 91800. >> IS THAT A TECHNICAL CHANGE TO THE AMENDMENT? THANK YOU, DIDN'T WANT TO START ALL OVER. AND LOOKS LIKE LITTLE ANTS

ON THE SCREEN, PLEASE BEAR WITH US. I WOULD SAY AS I LOOK AT THIS AND LOOK AT, IF YOU COULD GO BACK TO THE ASSUMPTION SUMMARY, RECOGNIZING YOU KNOW, WHERE WE ARE AND I THINK WITH COMMISSIONER DECHANT'S COMMENTS, I WANT TO PULL OUT THE OUT YEARS, SEE WHAT THAT LOOKS LIKE AND HOW WE SMOOTH IT, HOW WE CONTINUE TO USE AND LEVERAGE SOME OF THAT ROOM IN THE RESERVE TO SMOOTH THOSE AND WE HAVE TALKED ABOUT LOOKING AT, AND HAVE TO START EARLIER AND EARLIER, LOOKING AT TRYING TO THINK ABOUT WHAT DOES 2 OR 3 YEARS WORTH OF RAISE LOOK LIKE INSTEAD OF JUST ONE. I DON'T WANT TO SAY STABILIZE, I DON'T KNOW IF IT'S THE RIGHT WORD I'M THINKING OF ACROSS THE PERIOD OF TIME SO THERE IS NOT AS MUCH VOLATILITY OR ALSO NOT AS MUCH IN ANY GIVEN YEAR A RUN-UP TO IT, WE HAVE MORE OF A RANGE THAT WE WANT TO WORK TOWARDS. AND KNOWING JUST WHERE WE ARE -- I THINK MY INITIAL INCLINATION WOULD BE TO KEEP IT FLAT ACROSS OUR EMPLOYEES, EVEN UNDERSTANDING SOME OF THAT HISTORY AND SOME OF THAT IMPACT BUT ALSO COULD WORK WITH THE CURRENT RECOMMENDATIONS. COMMISSIONER BROWN-GHOSTON, COMMISSIONER CASTILLO, ADDITIONAL THOUGHTS, COMMENTS, WITH THE MOTION THAT IS ON THE FLOOR AS OUTLINED AND IDENTIFIED? >> THIS IS COMMISSIONER BROWN-GHOSTON. NO, I DO NOT HAVE ADDITIONAL COMMENTS. >> NEITHER DOES COMMISSIONER CASTILLO. >> THIS IS COMMISSIONER DECHANT, I DO HAVE. THE INCREASES OF YEARS 16 THROUGH 19, WHICH YOU HAVE QUOTED AND TALKED ABOUT, 100% SOME INCREASE, WERE DIFFICULT DISCUSSION YEARS AS WELL. AND I KNOW THAT THE NEGATIVE -- THE DECREASES THAT WE HAVE MADE IN THE LAST SEVERAL YEARS ARE IN RESPONSE TO THAT, AND SEEKING TO BE MY OWN PHRASE, MAYBE NOT YOURS OR SOMEBODY ELSE'S BUT TO RIGHT THE BOAT, THAT KIND OF THING. REGARDLESS OF WHERE I WAS AND I WOULD BE GLAD TO DISCUSS WHERE I WAS IN REGARD TO THOSE ISSUES AT THAT TIME, I DON'T THINK THAT'S PERTINENT. WHAT IS IN MY MIND, THOUGH, IS IT GRABS, HARD TO SAY, 100% INCREASE AND



WE ARE JUST TRYING TO GET BACK A LITTLE BIT OF THAT. AND I'M NOT CONVINCED THAT WE WELL THOUGHT OUT THE WHY. ANOTHER THING I WOULD LIKE FOR US TO DO BEFORE THE YEAR ENDS IN PREPARATION OF NEXT YEAR IS DEFINE WHAT OUR GOALS ARE, TO HAVE A GUIDE POST TO MOVE TOWARDS RATHER THAN LOOKING BACK AND SAYING IT WAS IMPROPER OR WHATEVER TO HAVE RAISED OVER A PERIOD OF FOUR YEARS BY 100% WITHOUT KNOWING WHY THAT WAS DONE AND CONSIDERING WHY THAT WAS DONE AND EITHER AFFIRMING OR REFUTING OR MAKING SOME MODIFICATION. BUT TO HAVE A GOAL TO LOOK AT. I FEEL LIKE WE DON'T KNOW WHERE WE ARE GOING OTHER THAN REACTION TO THE PAST AND I MUCH PREFER TO HAVE A PROACTIVE LOOK INTO THE FUTURE, HERE IS WHERE WE WANT TO END UP. IF WE WANT TO END UP WITH RETURNING TO 2015, BEFORE THE INCREASES STARTED, THEN WE HAVE SOMETHING TO SET OUR SIGHTS ON. AND I'M NOT PROPOSING THAT, NECESSARILY, BUT I THINK I MIGHT HAVE MADE THIS COMMENT A YEAR OR MORE AGO THAT WE ARE JUST KNEE JERKING IN MANY CASES AND IT'S NOT TO CALL THEM WRONG, I JUST -- I DON'T KNOW WHERE WE ARE HEADED AND I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHERE WE ARE HEADED AND I THINK THAT TAKES DISCUSSIONS TO DEFINE THAT, AND THEN WHERE WE ARE HEADED MAY TAKE US 5 TO 10 YEARS, I DON'T KNOW. AND OF COURSE, DIFFERENT PEOPLE CAN COME AND GO, BUT HOPEFULLY WE GET SOME THINGS OUT THERE THAT NEW COMMISSIONERS CAN LOOK AT AND RECOGNIZE THE WHY AND WHAT THE GOAL IS. >> THANK YOU. COMMISSIONERS, OTHER COMMENTS, QUESTIONS. >> THIS IS COMMISSIONER BROWN-GHOSTON. TO YOUR POINT, COMMISSIONER, I THINK THAT'S A VERY VALID POINT WE NEED TO KNOW THE END GAME, WHAT IS THE ULTIMATE GOAL. YOU KNOW, I AM NEW TO THE COMMISSION AND FOR ME JUST THE WAY THAT I PROCESS THINGS FOR ME IT IS HELPFUL TO HAVE THAT END GAME AND I WAS VERY APPRECIATIVE OF THE FACT YOU BROUGHT UP, COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT, BROUGHT UP HOUSE BILL 2218 IN TERMS OF THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE LEGISLATION TO HAVE A, KEEP THE

RESERVE AT 10% AND ANYTHING IN EXCESS OF THE 10% TO COME OUT WITH SOME RECOMMENDATIONS. SO CORRECT ME IF I'M WRONG, FOR ME I VIEW THAT AS THE END GAME AS THAT'S THE GOAL. IF WE HAVE ADDITIONAL GOALS, WHICH SOME OF THOSE WERE POINTED OUT DURING THE DISCUSSION IN TERMS OF, YOU KNOW, TRYING TO MITIGATE THE EXPENSES, THE OUT OF POCKET EXPENSES FOR THE FAMILY, THE EMPLOYEES, I THINK THAT'S ONE OF THE MOST IMPORTANT THINGS TO DO, ESPECIALLY CONSIDERING WHERE WE ARE AT ECONOMICALLY AND WHAT WE HAVE GONE THROUGH WITH THE PANDEMIC. SO YOU KNOW, I'M CERTAINLY OPEN TO HAVING MORE DISCUSSION ABOUT THAT. I THINK THOSE ARE VERY VALID POINTS TO BRING ABOUT ESPECIALLY CONSIDERING THAT YOU HAVE MYSELF WHO IS NEW, AND THEN WE WILL ALSO HAVE TWO ADDITIONAL NEW COMMISSIONERS COMING ON BOARD AND THAT'S ALL I WANT TO SAY ON THAT POINT. >> I THINK EACH YEAR MY HOPE IS THAT WE GET BETTER AT THIS. I THINK WE CAME INTO THIS CONVERSATION MORE INFORMED THAN A YEAR AGO AND MORE, WE STILL HAVE SOME WORK TO DO AS IDENTIFIED IN THE CONVERSATION AND SO I ASK THE COMMISSIONERS PATIENCE AND GRACE AS WE DO THAT BECAUSE THAT DOES TAKE TIME OF US COMING TOGETHER AND BEING ABLE TO HAVE THOSE CONVERSATIONS AND WE HAVE HAD SOME OF THOSE BUT WE HAVE NOT GOTTEN ALL THE WAY THERE IN THE COURSE OF THIS PAST YEAR. SO I HOPE THAT THOSE WHO ARE, COMMISSIONERS HERE A YEAR AGO RECOGNIZE WE HAVE DONE SOME OF THAT WORK, BUT IT CONTINUES TO BE ONGOING THAT WE HAVE TO LEAN INTO. SO, COMMISSIONER BROWN-GHOSTON. >> I DO HAVE A RECOMMENDATION ALSO. YOU KNOW, WE RECEIVED THE INFORMATION ON MONDAY, THE MEETING WAS ON FRIDAY, I WAS WONDERING IF IT WOULD BE POSSIBLE TO GET IT A LITTLE SOONER SO WE CAN HAVE, AND FOR ME, WHEN I SAY THAT, IF I CAN HAVE AT LEAST A WEEKEND TO LOOK OVER IT, THAT'S HELPFUL. >> OK. YES, WE CAN HOLD ON THAT ONLY BECAUSE THERE WAS AN OPEN MOTION ON THE FLOOR BUT WE WILL TAKE THAT, AND WE, COMMISSIONERS, I'M GOING TO JUST ASK YOU

ALL PATIENCE. WE TRIED AND WE PUSHED OUT AND PART IS TRYING TO ALSO ENSURE THAT YOU HAVE COMPLETE PACKETS OF INFORMATION AND WE TRY TO GET THEM OUT A FULL WEEK AHEAD AND WHEN THEY CAN PUSH OUT THINGS BEFORE THAT WE DO. SO AS AN ADMINISTRATIVE PIECE, THE STAFF WILL CONTINUE TO TRY TO DO, TO GET THE INFORMATION OUT AND THROUGH, BUT I'LL ASK YOU TO HOLD A LITTLE BIT MORE ON THAT AS WELL AS SOME OTHER TOOLS THAT THE STAFF WANT TO INTRODUCE LATER THAT I THINK WILL ALSO HELP THE COMMISSIONERS BE ABLE TO SEE IT AT YOUR OWN IN REALTIME AND REFER BACK TO IT. WITH THAT, I JUST DON'T WANT TO -- I WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT WE DON'T LEAVE THE MOTION THAT IS ON THE FLOOR. DULY NOTED. >> COMMISSIONER, I COULD NOT HEAR YOU. >> HELPS IF I TURN IT OWN, DOESN'T IT. PROJECTION SUMMARY SCREEN, PLEASE. OK. THANK YOU. >> ANY ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS WITH THE MOTION THAT IS ON THE FLOOR AS HAS BEEN PREVIOUSLY STATED? >> I THINK I'M FINISHED. >> COMMISSIONER, NO MORE QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS ON THE MOTION THAT IS OPEN? WE ARE GOING TO VOTE. I AM GOING TO DO A ROLL CALL VOTE JUST BECAUSE OF THE NATURE OF IT AND WANTING TO MAKE SURE THAT WE HAVE A CLEAN RECORD. SO THIS IS FOR THE MOTION AS PREVIOUSLY STATED, CLOSING DISCUSSION, AND TAKING A ROLL CALL VOTE. [ROLL CALL VOTE TAKEN] >> OUR PLAN DESIGN HAS BEEN APPROVED FOR THE PLAN YEAR 2022. OK. MAKE SURE I HAVE MY YEARS RIGHT. WE WILL MAKE SURE AS ALWAYS IT'S REFLECTED IN THE MINUTES SO THAT WE ARE ALL ON THE SAME PAGE. ALL RIGHT, COMMISSIONERS. THANK YOU FOR THAT, THANK YOU FOR EVERYONE'S PATIENCE AND RICH AND GOOD DISCUSSION AS WE MOVE THROUGH THAT. IT IS NOT EASY WORK. WE HAVE OTHER AGENDA ITEMS. OUR NEXT -- >> CAN WE TAKE A QUICK BREAK? >> YES, THANK YOU, COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT. TAKE ABOUT A FIVE-MINUTE BREAK, AND BE BACK AT AROUND ABOUT 20 AFTER. ALL RIGHT? THANK YOU. TEST. >> TEST. >> JUNE 18, 2021. >> JUNE 18, 2021. >> HIS CONCERN WAS PROVIDER NETWORK, AND ASKED A FEW QUESTIONS ABOUT HOW OUR PROCUREMENT

PROCESS. THE MEETING WENT REALLY WELL. IT WAS A HALF AN HOUR TEAMS MEETING, AND HE LEFT WITH THE DISCUSSION. HE'S AWARE OF RECOMMENDATION FOR VISA. >> WHEN I PHONED HIM THE DAY AFTER THE MEETING HE HAD NOT HEARD OF A VISA SO I THOUGHT THAT WAS CONCERNING TO ME. I DO APPRECIATE THAT. THANK YOU. >> I WOULD ENTERTAIN A MOTION. >> I MOVE THAT WE. >> IS THERE A SECOND? >> COMMISSIONER CASTILLO, I SECOND THAT. >> ANY ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION, COMMISSIONERS? SEEING AND HEARING NONE, I WILL CALL FOR THE VOTE. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR SAY AYE. OPPOSED. NO. AND I WOULD LIKE TO EXPLAIN MY VOTE. COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT. >> OKAY. THANK YOU. VICKI SCHMIDT. I VOTE NO THE MOTION TO WARD THE VISION CONTRACT. EACH YEAR THE STATE EMPLOYEE HEALTH PLAN EXPENDS NEARLY HALF A BILLION DOLLARS ON MEDICAL CLAIMS, CONTRACTORS AND OTHER EXPENSES OF THE PLAN. AS MEMBER OF THE HEALTHCARE COMMISSION, WE HAVE A DUTY TO ENSURE THAT THE MEMBERS OF THE PLAN RECEIVE GOOD VALUE FOR THE TREMENDOUS AMOUNTS OF TAX DOLLARS AND EMPLOYEE CONTRIBUTIONS THAT ARE CONTRIBUTED TOWARDS THEIR HEALTHCARE. GOOD VALUE IS NOT ALWAYS THE LOWEST PRICE. INSTEAD, MANY FACTORS SHOULD GUIDE OUR SELECTION OF VENDORS. WE SHOULD CONSIDER SUCH THINGS AS COST, ACCESS TO PROVIDERS, QUALITY OF CARE, AND THE BENEFITS THAT ARE ACTUALLY OFFERED TO THE PLAN MEMBERS, THEIR SPOUSES AND INDEPENDENT TO INSURE WE SELECT THE PLAN THAT IS THE BEST INTEREST OF THE PLAN. THE COMMISSIONERS SHOULD HAVE FULL ACCESS TO THE INFORMATION DURING THE SELECTION PROCESS. COMMISSIONERS SHOULD HAVE INPUT INTO THE CHOICE OF BENEFIT DESIGN AND SHOULD BE AFFORDED THE OPPORTUNITY TO ASK BIDDER'S QUESTIONS OF THEIR PROPOSAL. BY STATUTE THE IT IS EXEMPT FROM SOME OF THE STATE'S PROCUREMENT STATUTES AND THE PROCESSES USED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION. THE HTC HAS THE AUTHORITY AND THE ABILITY TO SET PROCUREMENT PROCESS IN SUCH A WAY THAT THE ISSUES I LOUT OUTLINED ARE

ADDRESS. I LOOK FORWARD TO THAT DAY. BECAUSE THE PROCESS WAS THREWED I VOTE NO. >> THANK YOU, COMMISSIONER. ANY ABSTENTIONS? ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU. NEXT ITEM IS THE HRA, HSA. >> OKAY. THIS IS JANET STANEK, YOU FIND THAT ON PAGE 73 OF YOUR PACKET. WE GO ON TO EXPLAIN AND I WON'T READ THE ENTIRE OUTLINE OF THE POWERPOINT, BUT HEALTH REIMBURSEMENT ACCOUNT AND WHAT THAT IS IN A HEALTH SAVINGS ACCOUNT. THE DATES ARE OUTLINED AND WHAT THE PROCESS WAS AND BIDDING CLOSED ON MARCH THIS OF THIS YEAR. WE HAD SEVEN BIDS RECEIVED. ALE FINALIST MEETING WAS HELD WITH FOUR OF THOSE COMPANIES AND THERE WERE COMMUNICATIONS BACK AND FORTH INCLUDING LEGAL ON ALL OF THOSE COMPANIES ON THEIR RESPECTIVE BIDS. EVALUATION PRIMARILY CONCERNS THE HEALTH PLAN SERVICES THAT ARE PROVIDED, WHAT CUSTOMER SERVICES ARE TO OUR MEMBERS AND TO THE TEAM. PAGE 78 OUTLINES THE SERVICES INCLUDED IN SUCH CONTRACTS. HOW THE HEALTH PLAN ADMINISTRATION PORTAL WORKS WITH THAT AND THE COMMUNICATIONS THAT GO TO THE MEMBERS. THE PRICING FOR THIS PLAN IS OUTLINED FOR THE HRA ONLY ON 79. YOU WILL SEE THE FOUR FINALIST BIDS, NEW SYNERGY AND TASK, AND THEIR RESPECTIVE MONTHLY PER FEE AND ESTIMATED ONE YEAR AND THREE YEAR COSTS FOR THE PROPOSAL. WITH MET LIFE COMING IN AT 109 PER ACCOUNT, AND THE OTHERS COMING IN 150 AND 160. THE CURRENT CONTRACT PRICE THAT WE PAY FOR OUR EXISTING VENDOR IS 150, AND THERE IS 2,906 HRA ACCOUNTS. THE FOLLOWING PAGE 80 SHOWS THE HSA ACCOUNTS, AGAIN OUTLINING THE CURRENT CONTRACT PRICE WE PAY IS 85 CENTS PER MONTH FOR THOSE PEOPLES ABOUT AN ACCOUNT BALANCE LESS THAN 2,000 AND THERE ARE 11,626 MEMBERS WITH AN ACCOUNT BALANCE LESS THAN 2,000. SO THERE YOU WILL SEE THE CURRENT NUMBER OF ACCOUNTS IN THE HEALTH SAVINGS ACCOUNTS MONTHLY FEE PER ACCOUNT, WITH MET LIFE COMING IN AT ZERO. ON PAGE 81 IS OUR RECOMMENDATION. NEW SYNERGY IS THE INCUMBENT WE'VE HAD ADMINISTERED THE HRS AND HSA BENEFIT THE LAST THREE

YEARS. MET LIFE OFFERS NO COST TO THE MEMBERS FOR THEIR HSA REGARD REGARDLESS OF THE THEM BEER ACCOUNT BALANCE. THEY CHARGE NO FEE FOR OTHER STATEMENTS LIKE, ET CETERA. SO ASSESSING THE BID REQUIREMENTS, AND IN CONJUNCTION WITH LEGAL REVIEW AND NEGOTIATION OF THE BIDS, THE HR THEY'RE RECOMMENDING MET LIFE BE AWARDED THE CONTRACT FOR NEXT THREE-YEAR PERIOD BEGINNING JANUARY 21st OF '22. >> THANK YOU. QUESTIONS, COMMISSIONERS? >> VICKI SUBMIT. COULD WE GO BACK TO THE PRICING OF HSA? >> YES. >> ON THE -- THANK YOU. ON THE -- I DON'T UNDERSTAND THE NUMBERS OF ASI FLEX AND NEW SYNERGY 11,626, MET LIFE AND TASK SAY 17,263. AND THEN YOU TELL US THERE CURRENTLY 11,626 MEMBERS WITH AN ACCOUNT BALANCE LESS THAN 2,000, WHICH MATCHES PERFECTLY WITH NEW SYNERGY AND ASI FLEX. SO THOSE NUMBERS I CAN'T -- I CAN'T SQUARE THOSE NUMBERS. >> CAN I ASK YOU TO HELP ME WITH THAT? >> YEAH. MIKE MICHAEL. SO WITH ASI FLEX, THEY HAVE THRESHOLD WITH THE ACCOUNT BALANCE TIED TO THAT. SO MEMBER WOULD HAVE TO PAY THAT 50 CENTS PER MONTH FEE IF THEIR ACCOUNT BALANCE WAS LESS THAN \$2,000. TASK THEY WERE GOING TO CHARGE 78 CENTS FOR EACH MEMBER REGARDLESS OF THEIR ACCOUNT BALANCE. WITH TASK, THAT'S WHY THE 17,263, BECAUSE REGARDLESS OF YOUR ACCOUNT BALANCE, WE ALL WOULD PAY THAT FEE WHETHER WE HAD A THOUSAND DOLLARS IN THERE OR \$25,000 IN THERE. AND SINCE MET LIFE WAS ZERO, THE 17,263 REPRESENTS OUR TOTAL HSA ACCOUNT MEMBERS. >> OKAY. SO MAYBE ON THE TOP, THE HEADER SHOULDN'T BE CURRENT ACCOUNTS, IT SHOULD BE CURRENT ACCOUNTS THAT ARE GOING TO CHARGED A FEE. >> CORRECT. GOOD POINT. >> THAT'S OKAY. ON THE -- ON THE RECOMMENDATION -- MAY I CONTINUE? SORRY. >> I NOTICED THAT -- WELL FIRST OF ALL, IS NEW SYNERGY STILL A KANSAS COMPANY? >> YES. >> ARE THEY THE ONLY KANSAS BASED COMPANY OUT OF THE FOUR? >> WE DID NOT SEE THE ENTIRE BID OR THE RFP, THE COMMISSION DID NOT SEE THAT. WHEN YOU TALK ABOUT THERE IS NO FEES FOR OTHER SERVICES BY MET

LIFE ON REPLACEMENT CARD, PAPER STATEMENTS, INSUFFICIENT FUNDS FEE, INVESTMENT ACCOUNT, OR INVESTMENT FEE ON THE INVESTMENT ACCOUNT ASSET, WHAT IS THE COST OF THOSE? DO WE -- DID THEY -- DID EACH ONE OF THE BIDDERS TELL YOU WHAT REPLACEMENT CARD COSTS AND WHAT A PAPER STATEMENT COSTS, AND -- >> THE CARD -- YES, THE CARD FOR SURE. PETE MANAGES IT. >> YES, MA'AM, WE GOT OUTLINES AS PART OF THE COAST PROPOSAL FOR EACH ONE OF THE BIDS. >> WELL, IT WOULD HAVE BEEN NICE FOR US TO SEE THOSE. AND SO DO THE -- DOES THE EMPLOYER PAY FOR THAT OR THE EMPLOYEE? >> EMPLOYEE. >> EMPLOYEE PAYS FOR ALL OF THOSE THINGS? >> YES, THOSE FEES LISTED ON PAGE 81 THOSE WOULD BE FEES THAT THE MEMBER WOULD INCUR. >> I THINK IT WOULD HAVE BEEN NICE -- IT WOULD HAVE BEEN HELPFUL TO SEE THE COMPARISON OF WHAT -- OF WHAT THAT -- BECAUSE NOW WE DON'T REALLY HAVE A COMPARISON BETWEEN OTHER THAN MET LIFE IS ZERO ACROSS THE BOARD ON THOSE, WE DON'T KNOW WHETHER GOING WITH THE KANSAS COMPANY WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN THAT MUCH MORE EXPENSIVE OR -- WE JUST DON'T KNOW THAT. >> ANY QUESTIONS, COMMISSIONERS? I WOULD ENTERTAIN A MOTION. >> THANK YOU. I MOVE THAT WE AWARD THE HRA, HSA CONTRACT TO -- FOR THREE YEARS TO MET LIFE AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF. >> IS THERE A SECOND? >> COMMISSIONER CASTILLO. I SECOND THAT MOTION. >> THERE IS A SECOND. ANY ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION, COMMISSIONERS, QUESTIONS OR DISCUSSION ON THE RECOMMENDATION? >> LET'S GO TO COMMISSIONER -- >> SO THIS IS COMMISSIONER BROWN, I WANT TO BE CLEAR ON THE -- LOOKING AT THE PRICING PAGE ON PAGE 80. IT STATES THE MET LIFE COST WILL BE ZERO. WE'RE ASSUMING WHEN YOU'RE LOOKING AT ALL THE PLANS WE'RE SAYING IT'S NOT GOING TO COST THE STATE ANYTHING OR THAT'S THE EMPLOYEE? >> THE MEMBER. >> THAT'S THE MEMBER COST. OKAY. DO WE KNOW WHAT IT COSTS THE STATE TO -- >> TO RUN THE PLAN? >> IS THAT THE PAGE 79 INFORMATION? >> PAGE 79 SAYS HRA. >> SO MA'AM FOR THE HSA, THOSE ARE ENTIRELY PAID BY THE MEMBER. >> OKAY. >>

FEES ARE. >> OKAY. GOTCHA. OTHER QUESTIONS OR DISCUSSION? I'M SORRY. COMMISSIONER DECHANT. >> FOLLOW UP TO ONE OF THE COMMENTS THAT COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT MADE. REFERRING TO NUE SYNERGY AS THE ONLY KANSAS COMPANY. I'M NOT FAMILIAR WITH THE GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES GIVING PREFERENCE TO LOCAL CONTRACTORS FOR DIFFERENT THINGS IN THIS STATE. IN THIS CASE, THE STATE GIVING TO -- BUT IS THERE A -- MAYBE THE QUESTION IS TO YOU MADAM CHAIR, IS THERE A POLICY, PRACTICE, WHATEVER, THAT MAYBE 5% OR 10% DIFFERENCE IS ALLOWED OF AN IN-STATE BIDDER, JUST TO RECOGNIZE THAT THERE ARE LOCAL -- BUSINESS THAT CONDUCTS THEIR BUSINESS HERE IN OUR STATE? >> IT IS NOT. >> DO YOU UNDERSTAND MY QUESTION? >> YES. IT IS NOT FROM STATE PROCUREMENT PRACTICE. I THINK LIKE MANY OTHER FACTORS IT CAN BE TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION AND SOMETIMES ALSO IT'S ABOUT FAMILIARITY AND THINGS OF THAT NATURE LIKE INCUMBENT MIGHT HAVE THAT, AS WELL. AND SO IT'S ONE FACTOR, ONE CONSIDERATION, THAT CAN BE USED AS ONE OF THE MANY DECIDING FACTORS IN ANY PROCUREMENT PROCESS. >> IT'S AN ELEMENT THAT IS TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION. >> I WOULD SAY THAT AGAIN AS THAT ADDS TO FAMILIARITY, CONNECTIVITY, THINGS OF THAT NATURE, IT CAN BE, DOESN'T ALWAYS HAVE TO BE, AND -- LET ME PHRASE IT THIS WAY. IT'S NOT IN STATUTE OR LAGS THAT IT MUST BE. I WOULD PHRASE IT FROM A PROCUREMENT STANDPOINT. >> OKAY. THANK YOU. >> OTHER QUESTIONS? COMMENTS? THERE IS A MOTION ON THE FLOOR. HEARING NONE, I WILL CLOSE THE DISCUSSION AND MOVE US TO A VOTE. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR OF THE RECOMMENDATION TO APPROVE MET LIFE FOR A THREE YEAR CONTRACT FOR HRS, HSA PLANS, SAY AYE. >> AYE. >> OPPOSED. >> NO. >> AND THAT'S FOR THE RECORD COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT. AS PREVIOUSLY NOTED. AND ABSTENTIONS? ANY ABSTENTIONS? OKAY. >> COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT -- >> PARDON ME, SORRY. >> I WASN'T SURE. I WOULD LIKE TO EXPLAIN MY NO VOTE. I VOTE NO THE MOTION TO AWARD THE HRAA, HSA HEALTHCARE PLAN. CONTRACTORS AND OTHER



EXPENSES OF THE PLAN. AS MEMBERS OF THE HEALTHCARE COMMISSION WE HAVE A DUTY TO BE SURE THAT MEMBER OF THE PLAN RECEIVE GOOD VALUE FOR THE TREMENDOUS AMOUNT OF TAX DOLLARS AND EMPLOYEE CONTRIBUTIONS THAT ARE CONTRIBUTED TOWARDS THEIR HEALTHCARE. GOOD VALUE IS NOT ALWAYS THE LOWEST PRICE. INSTEAD MANY FACTORS SHOULD GUIDE OUR SELECTION OF VENDORS. WE SHOULD CONSIDER THINGS AS -- SUCH THINGS AS COST, ACCESS TO PROVIDERS, QUALITY OF CARE AND BENEFITS THAT ARE ACTUALLY OFFERED TO THE PLAN MEMBERS, SPOUSES AND INDEPENDENTS TO ENSURE WE SELECT THE PLAN THAT IS THE BEST INTEREST TO THE PLAN THE COMMISSIONERS SHOULD HAVE FULL ACCESS TO INFORMATION. COMMISSIONERS SHOULD HAVE INPUT INTO THE CHOICE OF BENEFIT DESIGN AND BE AFFORDED THE OPPORTUNITY TO ASK BIDDERS QUESTIONS OF THEIR PROPOSALS. BY STATUTE EXEMPT FROM SOME OF THE PROCUREMENT STATUTES AND THE PROCESSES USED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION. WHICH COULD INCLUDE PREFERENCE TO STATE CONTRACTOR? IN SUCH A WAY THE ISSUES I OUTLINED ARE ADDRESSED. I LOOK FORWARD TO THAT DAY BUT BECAUSE THE PROCESS FOR AWARDING THE CONTRACT WAS FLAWED I VOTE NO. >> THANK YOU, COMMISSIONER. ALL RIGHT. WE ARE GOING TO CONTINUE TO MOVE THROUGH OUR AGENDA OF NEW BUSINESS. THE NEXT ITEM IS THE COVID-19 VACCINE INCENTIVE RECOMMENDATION. JANET, ARE YOU GOING TO COVER THAT? >> I THINK MOST OF YOU PROBABLY SAW IN THE PACKET THE RECOMMENDATION AND PART OF IT IS DUE TO -- I THINK COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT RAISED THAT QUESTION A WHILE BACK THEY CAME OUT WITH NEW RECOMMENDATIONS AND GUIDANCE ON THE ABILITY TO OFFER INCENTIVE AND WHAT GOES WITH THAT. STEVE LET ME KNOW YESTERDAY IT DID NOT OPEN ON THE FLY SO I SENT YOU ALL OUT A LINK TO THAT IF YOU DID NOT SEE THAT TO SHOW YOU WHAT THE GUIDANCE SAID. IT'S PRETTY CLEAR WE HAD BEEN RESEARCHING WHAT WE COULD DO WITH THE PROGRAM TO SEE HOW WE COULD MODEL THAT TO ALLOW PEOPLE TO -- HAVE THAT DATA ENTERED, BECAUSE THERE

ARE SO MANY VARIOUS WAYS THAT EMPLOYEES, MEMBERS ARE GETTING THEIR VACCINE. THERE IS NO STANDARD PLACE TO ROUTE IT THROUGH CLAIMS OR ONE STOP SHOP. I WOULD HAVE TO BE ON THE HONOR SYSTEM. THEY WOULD SELF REPORT. THEY WOULD -- AND ONE SUGGESTION WE WOULD HAVE THEM EITHER PUT THE DATE OF THEIR FIRST OR SECOND -- SECOND SHOT OR THE SINGLE SHOT DATE, WHERE IT WAS AT, AND THE NAME OF THE PHARMACY PROVIDER, WHOEVER, AND THEN SUBMIT AND THEIR CREDITS WOULD BE AWARDED IMMEDIATELY. WE KEPT IT IN ALIGNMENT, THE RECOMMENDATION IS, IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE FLU SHOT EQUIVALENT, AND SO THEY WOULD GET THREE CREDITS TO THEIR 221 PLAN YEAR. SO THAT'S WHERE WE'RE AT WITH IT AFTER GOING WITH IT, BACK AND FORTH WITH JOHN AND THE SECRETARY AND OUR TEAM TO LOOK AT THIS. THAT'S THE RECOMMENDATION. THANK YOU. >> COMMISSIONERS AS YOU REMEMBER WE TALKED ABOUT THIS A FEW TIMES. ONE OF THE THINGS WE WERE WAITING ON PER LEGAL COUNSEL WAS THE EEOC BECAUSE THIS IS AN EMERGENCY APPROVED VACCINE AND NOT LIKE OTHERS. AND SO WITH THAT COMING IN AND THE TIMING OF THIS MEETING WE WERE LIKE LET'S GET IT IN THERE. THE ONE THING AS JANET MENTIONED I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT WE -- AS WE CONSIDER THIS, IS THAT PIECE THAT THIS WILL WORK A LITTLE BIT DIFFERENTLY BECAUSE OF THE WAY THE VACCINE DISTRIBUTION HAS HAPPENED TO DATE, THAT IT WILL BE -- THE RECOMMENDATION IS THAT IT'S A SELF REPORT, A SELF IDENTIFICATION. I KNOW JUST BECAUSE WE HAVE TALKED ABOUT IT, ONE OF THE -- ONE OF -- ONE OTHER WAY COULD BE AN UPLOAD OF YOUR CARD. HOWEVER, WE LEARNED THAT THERE ARE SOME PROVIDERS THAT DIDN'T PROVIDE A HARD COPY CARD AND PROVIDED A LINK TO A SITE WHERE YOU COULD -- AND SO YOU KNOW TRYING TO COME UP WITH WAYS TO MAKE THIS AS ACCESSIBLE AS POSSIBLE IS WHERE THIS RECOMMENDATION I THINK HOW THE TEAM CAME UP WITH THAT. TO NOT, YOU KNOW, PUSH SOMEONE TO HAVE TO GO THROUGH TWO OTHER SYSTEMS TO GET A CARD, TO THEN UPLOAD INTO THIS SYSTEM FOR VERIFICATION. THE ONE THING

IS AS WE LOOK AT AS YOU ALL KNOW WITH YOU KNOW OUR -- THE HEALTHQUEST PORTAL WE HAVE THE ABILITY TO MAKE THESE CHANGES, BUT WE ALSO ON ANNUAL BASIS YOU KNOW CAN LOOK AT THIS. THE GOOD PART IS AS WE GO INTO NEXT YEAR BY THE FALL WE MAY KNOW A LITTLE BIT MORE, LIKE IF THERE IS GOING TO BE A BOOSTER OR THINGS LIKE THAT AND THAT DISTRIBUTION MIGHT LOOK DIFFERENTLY AND WE CAN PLAN ACCORDINGLY GOING FORWARD. SO YOU WILL SEE THAT THIS RECOMMENDATION IS FOR PLAN YEAR 2021 ONLY. AND I JUST MENTIONED THAT BECAUSE I WANT US TO MAKE SURE THAT IF THIS GETS APPROVED WE REVISITED TOWARDS THE END OF THE YEAR ONCE WE HAVE MORE INFORMATION AROUND IT TO SEE IF THIS IS SOMETHING THAT MIGHT NEED TO LOOK DIFFERENT FOR 2022 GOING FORWARD. SO WITH THAT COMMISSIONERS ARE THERE OTHER QUESTIONS? COMMENTS? COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT? >> THANK YOU, MADAM CHAIR. I WOULD THINK THAT THERE IS SOME PROGRAMMING THAT HAS TO GO IN PLACE OR IS THAT -- HOW LONG -- WHEN WOULD THIS BE ACTIVE IF IT WAS VOTED ON? >> IT COULD BE WITHIN NEXT COUPLE WEEKS. THEY ALREADY IT MARKED UP AND PAUL IS NOT HERE TODAY BUT HE TOLD ME WHAT THAT WOULD LOOK LIKE, SO PRETTY QUICKLY. >> WITH THAT I WOULD MOVE TO AWARD THREE CREDITS FOR THE SELF ADDED STATION FORM OF GETTING YOUR COVID-19 VACCINATION FOR STATE EMPLOYEES, FOR THE -- AND THEIR DEPENDENTS I GUESS GETTING HEALTHCARE, HEALTHQUEST CREDIT, FOR THE 2020 PLAN YEAR. >> I WONDER IF YOU COULD CONSIDER A SECOND. >> IS THAT OUT OF ORDER? >> I THINK WE NEED TO SECOND IT AND THEN YOU CAN INTRODUCE A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT. DO WE HAVE A SECOND ON THE AMENDMENT THAT IS ON THE FLOOR? >> SECOND. >> BEEN SECONDED. NOW WE ARE IN DISCUSSION WHERE A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT OR A -- NOT COUNTER. A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT COULD BE PROPOSED. >> MAYBE IT'S NOT FRIENDLY. >> IT MAY NOT BE FRIENDLY. AN AMENDMENT CAN BE PROPOSED. >> AS I THOUGHT ABOUT THIS I WOULD LIKE TO SEE US OFFER MORE POINTS THAN THREE, WHICH IS THE FLU SHOT. MY THINKING

BEING THAT COVID WAS -- IS CERTAINLY A VIRUS THAT HAS MUCH MORE DRAMATIC AND DRASTIC POTENTIAL NEGATIVE OUTCOMES. AND THAT I WOULD LIKE TO SEE US INCENTIVIZE THE COVID SHOT TO A LEVEL GREATER THAN THE FLU SHOT. NOT TO SAY THE FLU SHOT CAN'T CAUSE DEATH, AS WELL BUT DOES NOT HAVE THAT QUANTITY OF IMPACT THAT COVID HAS HAD. I WAS THINKING SIX. I'M NOT HARD LOCKED INTO THAT, BUT I WAS THINKING SIX POINTS. AND I'M THINKING AT THIS POINT IN TIME, GIVEN THE -- WHAT I UNDERSTAND TO BE THE EFFORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF PUBLIC HEALTH OFFICIALS, BY AND LARGE, TO HIT A 70%, 80%, WHATEVER, AND IN THIS STATE WE SEEM TO BE STARTING TO STALL, THAT IF WE CAN HAVE SOME IMPACT ON INCENTIVIZING AMONG AT LEAST STATE HEALTH INSURANCE MEMBERS, THAT IT WOULD BE A BENEFIT TO THE STATE. >> IS THAT A FORMAL AMENDMENT THAT YOU'RE INTRODUCING OR ARE YOU JUST BRINGING THIS UP IN DISCUSSION AT THIS POINT? >> WHATEVER IS PROPER. IF IT'S -- THE WAY TO GO IS TO MAKE IT AMENDMENT I OFFER THAT AS AMENDMENT. >> SO THERE IS AN AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION THAT IS ON THE FLOOR TO CHANGE THE POINTS FROM THREE TO SIX. WE WILL NOW OPEN DISCUSSION ON THE AMENDMENT. >> DO YOU NEED A SECOND? >> NO, NOT ON THE AMENDMENT, I DON'T. THANK YOU. ANY DISCUSSION AROUND THAT REACTION? >> THIS IS COMMISSIONER -- I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHERE YOU ARE GETTING YOUR DATA FROM STEVE IN REGARDS TO COMMISSIONER STEVE IN REGARDS TO THE IMPACT THAT COVID-19 HAS HAD AS OPPOSED TO THE FLU VIRUS, TO COME UP WITH THE RECOMMENDATION TO DOUBLE THE INCENTIVE POINTS. >> WHAT I READ IN THE NEWSPAPERS, WHAT I HEAR IN NEWS IN TERMS OF LOOKING AT DEATHS ALONE, AND THE DEATHS THAT TEND TO OCCUR FROM YEAR-TO-YEAR IN THE PAST, DUE TO THE REGULAR FLU I HAVE NOT READ MEDICAL JOURNALS, ET CETERA. >> OKAY. I WOULD LIKE TO SAY BASED OFF OF THAT THE DATA DOESN'T SUPPORT WHAT YOU'RE REPORTING, SO WITH THAT BEING SAID I WOULD SUGGEST WE -- IT MAINTAIN THE THREE POINTS. IS THAT CORRECT HOW I -- >> THIS IS JUST

DISCUSSION. WE WILL HAVE TO TAKE A VOTE ON THE AMENDMENT, AND IF IT -- IF IT PASSES THEN IT MODIFIES THE ORIGINAL MOTION. IF IT FAILS, THEN WE GO BACK TO THE ORIGINAL MOTION. >> EITHER WAY I THINK YOU HAVE TO VOTE ON THE ORIGINAL MOTION. IF IT PASSES IT'S AN AMENDED MOTION. >> YES. >> AND THEN -- >> THANK YOU. OTHER COMMENTS AROUND THE CREDIT? >> I WILL SAY I KNOW WHEN WE HAD OUR INTERNAL DISCUSSIONS MY INITIAL RECOMMENDATION WAS THREE THE ALIGN IT WITH FLU AND NOT NECESSARILY LEANING ONE WAY OR THE OTHER BUT IN TERMS OF SIMILAR PRACTICES, ENCOURAGING, AND IT'S -- IT'S IN AND OF ITSELF IS AN ADD TO THOSE THAT ARE PARTICIPATING. I WILL SAY I THINK OUR PARTICIPATION IN THE HEALTHQUEST AND THE WELLNESS PROGRAM IS AROUND ABOUT 62% OF STATE EMPLOYEES. SO I'M ALSO HOPEFUL THAT WITH THIS AND POSSIBILITY THAT MAYBE IT ALSO MAY SEE A LITTLE BIT OF AN INCREASE IN THAT PARTICIPATION, PEOPLE WANTING TO LEARN ABOUT IT UNDERSTAND WHAT SOME OF THOSE BENEFITS ARE, THAT YOU CAN GAIN FROM GETTING THOSE POINTS BECAUSE THEY'RE LISTENING TO SOME OF THESE CONVERSATIONS AND THE IMPORTANCE OF THEM. WITH THAT, HEARING NO MORE DISCUSSION ON THE AMENDMENT, WE WILL TAKE A VOTE ON THE AMENDMENT TO CHANGE THE AWARD CREDITS THAT ARE PROPOSED FROM THREE TO SIX IN THE MOTION. SO WE'RE NOT VOTING ON IF WE'RE GOING TO MAKE IT. WE'RE ONLY VOTING ON ARE WE CHANGING THE MOTION, THE MOTION FOR THE RECOMMENDATION, FROM THREE CREDITS TO SIX CREDITS, DEPENDING ON WHAT HAPPENS WE WILL THEN TAKE AN ACTUAL VOTE ON THE ACTUAL RECOMMENDATION TO INTRODUCE THIS AS A NEW AWARD. ARE THE COMMISSIONERS UNDERSTANDING? THIS IS A VOTE TO CHANGE IT FROM THREE TO SIX FOR CONSIDERATION. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR OF CHANGING THE AWARD RECOMMENDATION -- I'M SORRY. MY LEGAL COUNSEL HAS POINTED SOMETHING OUT. DO YOU HAVE TO ACCEPT? >> I'LL LEAVE THAT TO THE ROBERTS RULES. >> AND YOU ALL ARE CHALLENGING THE EDGE OF MY ROBERTS RULES, SO PLEASE BEAR

WITH US. >> I WILL SECOND IT JUST IN CASE. I'LL SECOND IT SO WE CAN MOVE ON. >> THANK YOU. WITH THAT I WILL CALL FOR A VOTE ON CHANGING THE RECOMMENDED AWARD CREDIT TO SIX AS PART OF THE RECOMMENDATION. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR OF SIX SAY AYE. OPPOSED. NO. ALL RIGHT. THAT FAILS. SO WE GO BACK TO THE ORIGINAL MOTION, WHICH IS TO AWARD THREE CREDITS IN RELATIONSHIP TO THE VACCINE -- THE COVID-19 VACCINE, APOLOGIES, WITHIN THE HEALTH CLASS FORM AND SO THAT IT WAS -- IT WILL BE A APPLICATION FORM THAT HAS OUTLINED IN THE RECOMMENDATION HERE. THAT IS ON THE TABLE. ANY ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION ON THAT RECOMMENDATION? AT THREE CREDITS. HEARING NONE, I WILL MOVE US TO A VOTE ON THE RECOMMENDATION. ALL OF THOSE IN FAVOR SAY AYE. OPPOSED. ABSTENTIONS? OKAY. THANK YOU. ALL RIGHT. MOVING THROUGH OUR AGENDA, OUR NEXT NEW BUSINESS ITEM IS THE PROCUREMENT PROCESS AND STATUTES. THIS -- THERE WAS INFORMATION IN YOUR PACKET WHICH WAS REALLY JUST THE STATUTES THEMSELVES. THIS CAME UP AS COMMISSIONERS RECALL AT OUR MAY 21st MEETING, AND COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT ASKED FOR THIS TOPIC TO BE FORMALLY BROUGHT BACK TO THE COMMISSION, AND AS SHE ALSO REFERENCED EARLIER DOING RFP CONVERSATION. SO AS WE MOVE INTO THIS PIECE A COUPLE THINGS THAT I WANT TO HIGHLIGHT AS WE KIND OF START THIS CONVERSATION. AS HAS BEEN POINTED OUT PREVIOUSLY, THE HCC BY STATUTE, AND I THINK IT'S OUTLINED IN ONE PIECE OF THE STATUTE THAT WE HAVE HERE, DOES HAVE AN EXEMPTION TO THE FULL STATE PROCUREMENT PROCESS THAT IS OUTLINED IN STATUTE. AND WE CURRENTLY TAKE CERTAIN PIECES OF LIBERTIES AROUND THAT IN OUR CURRENT PROCESS. AND SO WHILE I THINK OUR CURRENT PROCESS FOLLOWS VERY CLOSELY TO THE STATE STATUTE, THERE ARE PIECES THAT WE CURRENTLY DO THAT ARE SLIGHT VARIATION WHICH INCLUDE BASICALLY USING THE STATE EMPLOYEE HEALTH PLAN AND WHEN NECESSARY EXTERNAL PARTNERS OR EXPERTISE IN THE EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT OF OUR RFP. INSTEAD OF WHAT TRADITIONALLY HAPPENS IN THE STATE PROCESS FOR A

PROCUREMENT NEGOTIATION COMMITTEE, OUR STATE EMPLOYEE HEALTH PLAN STAFF, AND THAT EXPERTISE LEVERAGES INTO THAT STEP OF THE PROCESS. THEY ALSO MANAGE OUR RFP PROCESS ALMOST COMPLETELY THROUGH THE HEALTH PLAN. THEY WORK COLLABORATIVELY WITH THEM, BUT IT IS HOUSED WITHIN OUR SPACE. THE OTHER PIECE IS EARLIER THIS YEAR INTENT TO TRY TO BEGIN TO MAKE THIS PROCESS MORE TRANSPARENT AND TO PROVIDE INFORMATION, WE STARTED IMPLEMENTING I WANT TO SAY MAYBE IN DECEMBER WHERE WE WORKED TO TRY TO GET THE RFP TO THE COMMISSIONERS BEFORE THEY WERE PUBLISHED, SO THAT WE COULD -- COMMISSIONERS COULD GIVE FEEDBACK ON THE SCOPE, THE CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION, ALL OF THOSE ASPECTS OF THE RFP AS THAT -- AS WE MOVE THROUGH THAT PROCESS. THE OTHER PIECE THAT IS A SLIGHT VARIATION FROM THE STATE PROCESS IS THIS PIECE OF IT BECAUSE WE ARE COMMISSIONED -- A COMMISSION WITH THE FINAL APPROVING AUTHORITY, THE RECOMMENDATIONS ARE BROUGHT FORWARD BY THE STATE EMPLOYEE HEALTH PLAN TO US, AND THEN IN OUR PUBLIC MEETINGS WE MAKE THE FINAL VOTER DECISION ON THOSE WHICH IS SLIGHTLY DIFFERENT THAN THE STATE OUTLINED PROCESS. THERE IS ONE THING THAT IS IN STATUTE AS WE OPEN THIS CONVERSATION UP THAT I WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT WE ARE AWARE OF, THAT WE HAVEN'T NECESSARILY TAKEN AN OPPORTUNITY TO DO PER SE, AND IT MIGHT BE SOMETHING WE CONSIDER AS WE'RE HAVING THIS CONVERSATION. THE EXEMPTION AND THE WAY OUR STATUTE -- THE STATUTE IS WRITTEN, AND IF I AM LEANING TOO FAR INTO THIS I'M GOING TO ASK MY LEGAL COUNSEL TO LEAN IN, BUT WE DO HAVE AND WE HAVE EXERCISED EVEN THIS YEAR A FEW TIMES THE ABILITY TO HAVE A CLOSED MEETING FOR THE PURPOSES OF STRATEGIC NEGOTIATIONS, FOR PLANS AND CONTRACTS. WE HAVEN'T NECESSARILY USED OR EXECUTED THAT ON A PARTICULAR RFP OR A CONTRACT, BUT WE DO THAT ABILITY TO DO SO. AND THAT WOULD BE IF WE WERE TRULY LOOKING FOR A PLACE FOR A PARTICULAR CONTRACT THAT WAS NEEDED AT DIFFERENT LEVEL OF NEGOTIATIONS, THAT THAT IS WHAT WE

WOULD USE, BECAUSE WE STILL HAVE TO AND BE MINDFUL OF PROTECTING A CERTAIN PROPRIETARY INFORMATION AND MATERIALS IF WE WERE IN FULL NEGOTIATIONS. SO IT'S NOT SOMETHING WE'VE UTILIZED BUT IT IS SOMETHING THAT IS PART OF OUR STATUTES THAT COULD -- THAT WOULD -- COULD ALLOW US TO DO SO. WITH THAT, I WILL OPEN THIS DISCUSSION. THERE IS NOT NECESSARILY AN ACTION ITEM TIED TO IT, BUT THE DISCUSSION WAS REQUESTED. WE WANT TO HAVE IT AND SEE WHERE WE CAN LAND ON SOME OF THESE ISSUES OF CONCERN. SO COMMISSIONERS -- COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT. I'M TURNING TO YOU AND I SMILE BECAUSE YOU BROUGHT THIS ISSUE FORWARD, AND I WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT WE ARE GIVING YOU THAT SPACE TO HAVE THAT CONVERSATION. >> THANK YOU, MADAM CHAIR. I DO APPRECIATE THE OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS SOME OF THE ISSUES THAT I AM -- SOME OF THE TROUBLING THINGS THAT I FIND WITH THE PROCUREMENT PROCESS AND THE HTC. SO YOU'RE RIGHT, 75-6504 D DOES EXCLUDE THE HEALTHCARE COMMISSION, AND -- FROM THE OTHER PROCESS THAT THE REST OF THE STATE DOES. I THINK FOR ME THESE ARE THE ISSUES THAT I WOULD LIKE TO PUT ON THE TABLE. YOU KNOW, YES, I HAVE APPRECIATED THE FACT THAT YOU SENT US THE RFPs BEFORE THEY GET OUT TO SEE IF WE HAVE ANY SUGGESTIONS OR CHANGES OR IF THERE IS THINGS WE WOULD LIKE TO TWEAK. BUT -- OR THINGS THAT -- COMMENTS, YOU ASKED FOR COMMENTS. HOW ABOUT THAT. THAT'S A BETTER WAY TO PUT IT. BUT WE DON'T SEE THE -- AFTER THAT FACT, WE DON'T SEE THE RFPs BEFORE THEY GO OUT FOR BID. AND SO NONE OF US SEE THE RFPs. IF YOU SIT ON THE COMMISSION I'VE NEVER SEEN A RFP THAT GOES OUT FOR BID. SO THERE'S NO OPPORTUNITY FOR US TO ASK QUESTIONS. YOU KNOW, JUST LIKE WE DID TODAY, ASKING QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS, LIKE HAPPENED AT THE LAST MEETING WITH THE VISION CONTRACT, WE HAD QUESTIONS. WE NEEDED ANSWERS. BUT THEY -- THOSE QUESTIONS WEREN'T ABLE TO BE CONSIDERED AND MORE RESEARCH DONE AT THAT TIME. YOU KNOW, WE'RE BEING ASKED TO MAKE A DECISION ON AWARDDING THE AWARDDING OF A



CONTRACT THE SAME DAY THAT WE GET THE -- WELL, THE SAME DAY THAT WE'RE IN A PUBLIC MEETING. WE MAY GET THE MATERIALS FOUR DAYS OR A WEEK BEFOREHAND, BUT THAT IS WAY AFTER THE -- THAT'S WAY AFTER THE STAFF HAS ALREADY MADE THE DECISION ABOUT WHERE THEY WANT TO GO. YOU KNOW, I KNOW THAT WE -- CONFIDENTIALITY HAS BEEN MARK MENTIONED IN THE RFP PROCESS AND PRIOR DISCUSSIONS REGARDING THIS. AND YET YOU KNOW I DON'T -- I'M NOT SUGGESTING THIS, BUT YOU KNOW, HTC HAS FLEXIBILITY IN THAT CONFIDENTIALITY SPACE. I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT, I THINK IT SHOULD BE FOLLOWED, BUT I CAN ALSO SEE THE REASONING. BUT I'M USING THAT AS AN EXTREME EXAMPLE OF WHAT THE HTC COULD DO. SO BY YOUR PREVIOUS REMARKS, I THINK YOU SAID WE TAKE LIBERTIES AROUND THIS, AND YOU KNOW, SO OBVIOUSLY WE ARE NOT USING THE STATE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS FOR STATE -- FOR STATE AGENCIES, BECAUSE WE ARE EXEMPT UNDER THAT D. BUT WHAT PROCESS IS BEING UTILIZED? I DON'T KNOW ALL THE STEPS AND I WOULD DOUBT IF ANY OF THE COMMISSIONERS KNOW ALL THE STEPS IN THIS. YOU KNOW, IN THE STATE PROCESS YOU MENTIONED THE PROCUREMENT AND NEGOTIATING TEAM. WE DON'T -- I DO KNOW THAT HTC DOES NOT UTILIZE NEGOTIATING TEAM LIKE THE REST OF THE STATE DOES. BUT YOU KNOW USUALLY THE PROCUREMENT NEGOTIATING TEAM HAS -- I THINK THREE MEMBER TEAM, IF I REMEMBER RIGHT, AND USUALLY THERE IS A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE AGENCY ON THAT. MY REQUEST, AND BOY, I -- I DON'T -- I THINK I'VE DISTILLED IT DOWN INTO WHAT MY REQUEST IS. MY REQUEST THAT -- OF THE IS THAT YOU OUT LINE THE ROW CUREMENT PROCESS FOR HTC SO WE KNOW EXACTLY WHAT IS HAPPENING AND THE STEPS THAT ARE TAKEN. AND THEN I WOULD SUGGEST THAT WE MAKE A FORMAL MOTION OBVIOUSLY A FEW MEETINGS FROM NOW, BUT MAKE A FORMAL MOTION TO ADOPT THAT FORMAL POLICY. BECAUSE IF I'M A BIDDER IN THE PLAN RIGHT NOW, WHERE DO I GO TO FIND THE PROCESS? WE DON'T FOLLOW THE STATE PROCESS. AND WE DON'T ANYTHING IN A DOCUMENT THAT I'VE EVER SEEN ON WHAT OUR PROCESS IS. AND

THEN LET THE COMMISSIONERS SEE IF THEY -- IF THEY HAVE IN THAT -- IN THE PROCESS STEP MAYBE THERE ARE PLACES WHERE WE WANT TO MAKE A CHANGE, WHERE WE WANT TO SEE A RFP BEFORE IT HITS THE STREET. ON THE VISION PLAN, IT WAS KIND OF AN INTERESTING -- IT WAS AN INTERESTING PIECE OF THE MEETING. WHEN I TALK TO THE OPEN TO METRIC ASSOCIATION THEY SAID OKLAHOMA HAS THREE TO FOUR DIFFERENT OPTIONS AND MISSOURI HAS TWO TO THREE DIFFERENT OPTIONS. YOU KNOW, WHICH ALLOWS FOR JUST BASIC CHOICE AND YOU KNOW WE DIDN'T CONSIDER THAT IN OUR VISION PLAN. I THINK THAT DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE STATE ARE SERVED BY MORE -- BY DIFFERENT PROVIDERS. THE VISION PLAN IS NOT JUST ABOUT WHERE THE OPHTHALMOLOGISTS ARE. THEY'RE WHERE YOU CAN GET YOUR CONTACT LENSES AND YOUR EYEGASSES. SO IT'S -- THE PROVIDER IS MORE BROAD TERM. I USE THAT AS AN EXAMPLE. THAT IS MY DESIRE AS A MEMBER OF THE HCC. >> OKAY. SO I'M GOING TO RESPOND FIRST. SO I AM -- I THINK THAT THAT IS A GOOD RECOMMENDATION FOR US TO TRY TO WORK THROUGH THAT. I -- I THINK -- PART OF IT IS THAT I SIT MORE CLOSELY TO SOME OF THIS AND SO I KNOW THAT THE STRUCTURE IS THERE, BUT BEING ABLE TO ARTICULATE IT AND FORMALIZE IT I DON'T THINK IS A BAD THING. WHAT I DO ALSO BELIEVE IS IT GIVES US AN OPPORTUNITY AS WE HAVE NEWER COMMISSIONERS TO UNDERSTAND BOTH THOSE THAT NEED TO UNDERSTAND PARTS OF THE STATE PROCESS, AND THEN UNDERSTAND HOW WE DEVIATE FROM THAT OR HOW WE'RE GOING TO APPROACH OUR PROCESS. YOU KNOW, IT'S REALLY INTERESTING, COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT, BECAUSE WHEN YOU MENTIONED THAT POSSIBILITY IN RELATIONSHIP TO LIKE THE VISION PLAN, JUST TO GO BACK TO THAT, THAT ACTUAL OR THAT ABILITY OR THAT -- TO THINK ABOUT THAT HAVING MULTIPLE ACTUALLY STILL WOULDN'T FALL INTO THE SPACE OF THE AFTER. SO THAT'S WHERE MAKING SURE AS WE START TO TALK THROUGH SOME OF THIS UNDERSTANDING WHAT TYPES OF THINGS WE NEED TO BE THINKING ABOUT IT, WHICH STAGE, BECAUSE WHEN WE PUT OUT THE RFP, THAT WOULD HAVE BEEN THE SPACE TO SAY IF THE -- IF IT WOULD BE

AWARDED AS A SINGLE OR A MULTI. BUT AS WE THINK ABOUT EDUCATING JUST MORE ACROSS THAT PROCUREMENT PROCESS, THAT'S SOMETHING WE CAN ALSO INCORPORATE, UNDERSTANDING IF WE'RE THINKING ABOUT THAT, THAT'S THE STAGE AT WHICH WE NEED TO THOSE CONVERSATIONS AND THEN BECAUSE WE COULDN'T -- WE ACTUALLY COULDN'T AWARD A MULTI-IF THE RFP, WITHOUT DOING -- TAKING OTHER STEPS. AGAIN, FROM A PROCESS STANDPOINT. I THINK THAT GIVES -- LIKE IT HELPS TO SAY NOT ONLY JUST TRYING TO FORMALLY DOCUMENT WHAT IT IS, BUT IT ALSO MIGHT BE ABOUT A BROADER EDUCATION FOR THE ENTIRE COMMISSION OF HIKE OKAY, SO IN THE RFP THESE ARE THE TYPES OF THINGS THAT WE HAVE LEVERS THAT CAN BE USED AT THAT STAGE IN ANY CONTRACT, BUT ONCE WE GET TO HERE, THESE ARE THE LEVERS THAT MAKE SENSE, SO WE ALSO HAVE AN UNDERSTANDING OF LIKE -- OF THOSE DIFFERENT PARTS, EVEN AFTER WE LAY IT OUT. AND SO THOSE ARE MY -- AND I KNOW WE'VE TALKED THROUGH SOME OF THIS IN DIFFERENT SPACES, BUT THE IDEA OF LET'S TAKE A STEP BACK AND SEE IF WE CAN OUTLINE IT, FORMALIZE IT, BRING IT BACK FOR CONVERSATION AND DISCUSSION, WE'LL HAVE A FEW MORE COMMISSIONERS, AND THEN BEING ABLE TO THEN EVENTUALLY LAND IN THE PLACE WHERE WE HAVE A FORMAL MOTION TO ADOPT AFTER THE ABILITY FOR FEEDBACK AND DEBATE. I DON'T -- I THINK IS A GOOD OPPORTUNITY. COMMENTS FROM OTHER COMMISSIONERS? COMMISSIONER DECAN'T? >> STEVE DECHANT. I THINK THE OPPORTUNITY TO FURTHER DISCUSSION IS A GOOD ONE, BEFORE MOVING ONTO FORMAL MOTION KIND OF THING. I THINK WE ARE ON DIFFERENT ENDS, MAYBE NOT TOTALLY TO ONE END OR ANOTHER, BUT DIFFERENT SIDES OF THE MIDDLE OF THE SPECTRUM. IN DIFFERENT GOVERNING BODIES THAT I'VE BEEN INVOLVED W. I'VE TAKEN THE STANCE THAT THE STAFF -- THE STAFF OF THAT ORGANIZATION OR THAT SUPPORTS THAT ORGANIZATION OR THAT ENTITY IS THE GROUP OF KNOWLEDGEABLE PEOPLE, EDUCATED PEOPLE, TO SOME DEGREE, SOME EXPERTISE, AND BELIEVE THAT WAS -- IN OUR CASE WE RELY UPON THE STATE

HEALTH PLAN EMPLOYEES TO DO THE DUE DILIGENCE, DO THE -- FOLLOW THE PROCEDURES THAT HAVE TO BE FOLLOWED, AND THAT THERE IS A -- I UNDERSTAND FOR THE SHARED RESPONSIBILITY AND I TAKE THAT SERIOUSLY. AND WHEN I -- WHEN I'VE HEARD YOU COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT REFER TO YOUR TAKING IT SERIOUSLY, IT'S KIND OF INSUNNIATION I FEEL LIKE IT MEANS THAT I'M NOT, AND I DON'T BELIEVE THAT TO BE THE CASE. BUT I BELIEVE THERE IS A RELIANCE ON STAFF THAT NEEDS TO BE HAD. NONE OF US ARE GOING TO BE EXPERT OR KNOWLEDGEABLE IN THE FIELD. WE MIGHT HAVE SOME PIECES, BUT I EXPECT THE STAFF TO BE BROADLY KNOWLEDGEABLE AND TO HAVE DONE THE NECESSARY LEGWORK. IF I WANTED TO DO -- GET IN THE WEEDS AND DO THE LEGWORK I OUGHT TO GO TO WORK FOR THE STATE HEALTH INSURANCE PLAN. THAT'S KIND OF THE STANCE I TAKE, THAT WE'VE GOT -- QUITE FRANKLY PROBABLY SINGLE EMPLOYEE, ALTHOUGH THAT EMPLOYEE DOESN'T ANSWER TO US, THAT EMPLOYEE ANSWERS TO ONE OF OUR BOARD MEMBERS, ONE OF OUR MEMBERS. BUT THAT THE STAFF ARE NOT OURS AS A TOTAL, AND -- BUT THAT WE TO RELY AND EXPECT THEM TO DO THE WORK THAT NEEDS TO BE DONE AND DO IT RIGHT. AND IF WE WANT THINGS DONE DIFFERENTLY, THEN WE WORK THROUGH THAT AND MAKE THOSE DIRECTIVES KNOWN. I THINK THERE IS VALUE TO MAINTAINING SEPARATION OF THE FIVE OF US IN OUR OFFICIAL ROLE AS HEALTHCARE COMMISSIONERS. FROM THAT DIRECT CONTACT WITH THE VENDORS, AND I -- I DON'T KNOW FOR A FACT, BUT I THINK THAT THE PROCESS KIND OF HAS THAT IN MIND. AND I -- AND THAT WE HAVE A -- I HEARD THE TERM 30,000-FOOT LEVEL, BUT WE A DIFFERENT LEVEL OF LOOKING DOWN AT IT. AND AGAIN, RELY UPON THE STAFF. I ALSO THINK, AND I KNOW THAT WE MADE SOME EXCEPTIONS, SOME DEVIATION, BUT I THINK THAT THE CLOSER THAT WE STAY ALIGNED WITH THE STATE PROCUREMENT PROCESSES, THE BETTER THAT PROTECTS US FROM CHALLENGES, LIABILITY, IT, JUST BECAUSE WE HAVE THAT BULK OF THE STATE PROCESS TO FALL BACK TO. THE MORE THAT WE GO OUT ON OUR OWN, I THINK THAT THE MORE WE OPEN OURSELVES TO -- I

DON'T KNOW IF LIABILITY WOULD BE THE WORD, BUT POTENTIAL CONSEQUENCES OR NEGATIVE THINGS THAT WE WOULD HAVE TO DEAL WITH. THAT IS WHERE I'M AT. I KNOW THAT I TAKE A DIFFERENT TACK OR APPROACH. I DON'T HAVE THE INTEREST TO READ THE FINE PRINT OF RFPs. AND I SHOULDN'T SAY INTEREST, I THINK WE EACH INDIVIDUALLY HAVE THAT OPPORTUNITY AND THEY CAN POINT OUT THINGS. POTENTIAL CAN HAVE NEGATIVE IMPACTS, BUT HAVE THE TIME BUILT INTO WHERE WE CAN SEE OUT. THAT IS JUST KIND OF A -- A PHILOSOPHY OR WHERE I'M NAT TERMS OF APPROACH THOSE THINGS. I THINK IT HAS US ON TWO DIFFERENT SIDES OF THE MIDDLE, WHATEVER THAT MIGHT BE. >> OTHER COMMISSIONER COMMENTS? COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT? >> THANK YOU, MADAM SHARE. VICKI SCHMIDT. IF I COULD JUST RESPOND ON A FEW OF THE POINTS THAT YOU'VE MADE. I DO AGREE RON DIFFERENT SIDES OF THE SPECTRUM ON THIS BECAUSE I THINK THAT THE IF YOU HAD RESPONSIBILITY DOES NOT LIE WITH THE STAFF. IT LIES WITH THE COMMISSIONERS. AND SO -- AND I DON'T BELIEVE EVEN IN THE STATE PROCUREMENT PROCESS, THE AGENCY IS PART OF THE PROCUREMENT NEGOTIATING TEAM. SO THERE IS NO FIREWALL BETWEEN THE AGENCY AND SOMEBODY NEGOTIATING ON BEHALF OF THE AGENCY. SCHP, THE STAFF NEGOTIATES ON BEHALF OF THE HCC. NO DOUBT ABOUT IT. BUT THE ISSUES THAT I HAVE ARE THAT FOR EXAMPLE -- WELL, I DON'T WANT TO -- I SHOULDN'T -- WELL, THERE ARE TIMES WHEN WE HAVE QUESTIONS, WHEN WE'RE ON THE DAY THAT WE'RE ASKED TO MAKE THE DECISION, WE HAVE ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS. THOSE QUESTIONS SHOULD HAVE BEEN ASKED BEFORE THE STATE EMPLOYEE HEALTH PLAN MADE A RECOMMENDATION TO US. IN MY OPINION AS A COMMISSIONER. I DO WANT TO SEE THE RFP BEFORE IT HITS THE STREET. I'M ASKED NOW FOR OUR -- FOR INPUT, AND YOU KNOW, I KNOW THAT I AM IN A UNIQUE POSITION, A VERY UNIQUE POSITION, AND I ACCEPT THAT AND LIKE THAT. AND THAT I DO HAVE STAFF THAT ARE FAMILIAR WITH MEDICARE, AND CAN LOOK AT THE MEDICARE CONTRACTS WE'RE DOING. AND YOU KNOW, WE -- WE HAVE -- WE GET TO HANDLE THE COMPLAINTS FOR

THINGS THAT DON'T GO RIGHT IN INSURANCE PLANS. AND WE TAKE THAT VERY SERIOUSLY. SO YOU KNOW, I DO LIKE FOR MY STAFF TO OFFER SUGGESTIONS AND THINGS. WHAT I'M ASKING FOR IS TO OUTLINE THE PROCESS AND THEN LET US HAVE THE DISCUSSION IF THERE ARE POINTS WHERE THE HCC MAY WANT TO HAVE INPUT INTO IT. YOU KNOW, TODAY WHEN THE VISION PLAN COMES BACK WITH ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE THAT WASN'T IN THERE LAST WEEK, OR HOWEVER LONG AGO, IN MAY, WHEN WE DISCUSSED THE VISION PLAN AND WE DIDN'T GET A SECOND FOR THE -- TO MOVE THE PROCESS ON, YOU KNOW, NOW THEY'VE ADDED ADDITIONAL THINGS. WELL, MAYBE I WOULD LIKED TO ASKED THEM ABOUT ARE THERE -- CAN PEOPLE GET THEIR CONTACT LEARNS MAILED TO THEM OUT OF THIS PLAN? ARE THERE MAIL SERVICES? BECAUSE IF 30 SOME COUNTIES, 38, 39 COUNTIES HAVE NO OPTOMETRIST OR OPHTHALMOLOGIST IN THEM. I THINK THAT'S WHAT THAT SAID. I THINK THAT'S -- ANY WAY, THERE IS A SEGMENT OF OUR POPULATION THAT HAS NO ACCESS IN THEIR COUNTY ON OPHTHALMOLOGIST. I JUST USED THAT. I JUST USED THAT AS AN EXAMPLE OF THE QUESTION THAT I PROBABLY WOULD HAVE LIKED TO HAVE ASKED THE BIDDERS. SO THAT, YOU KNOW, I CAN APPRECIATE THE FACT THAT -- I CAN APPRECIATE THE FACT THAT I'M AN IN THE WEEDS PERSON. YOU CAN ASK MY FAMILY MEMBERS ABOUT THAT. AND I'M SURE THEY WOULD AGREE WITH ME. I AM AN IN THE WEEDS PERSON AND THAT'S WHERE I FEEL COMFORTABLE, IF I'M ASKED TO MAKE A DECISION, BECAUSE AS I SAID BEFORE, WE AWARD OVER HALF A BILLION DOLLARS IN CONTRACTS EVERY WE'RE. THAT'S A LOT OF MONEY GOING THROUGH THIS COMMISSION. AND I WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT I UNDERSTAND AND MAYBE EVEN POSSIBLY HAVE INPUT INTO THAT PROCEDURE. BUT I REALLY DO APPRECIATE MADAM CHAIR, YOU HAVE BEEN MOST GRACIOUS WITH ALLOWING THE DISCUSSION TO CONTINUE, AND I DO WANT TO THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR THAT, AND YOU KNOW I ALSO KNOW THAT AS A RECOVERING LEGISLATOR, YOU WIN SOME AND YOU LOSE SOME, AND IT DOESN'T MEAN YOU DON'T QUIT FIGHTING FOR THEM. BUT YOU KNOW, SO ANYWAY, I DO

APPRECIATE YOUR INDULGENCE. THANK YOU. >> IF I MIGHT RESPOND TO RESPONSE. >> COMMISSIONER DECHANT. >> YES. I ACCEPT THE FIDUCIARY RESPONSIBILITY IS OURS. HOW DO I SAY THIS. I EXPECT THE STAFF TO TAKE THOSE KIND OF THINGS INTO ACCOUNT AS PART OF WHAT THEY DO, WHAT QUESTIONS THEY ASK, WHAT RECOMMENDATIONS THEY COME TO US WITH. YES, THIS BODY IS WHERE THE BUCK STOPS, SO TO SPEAK, IN THAT REGARDS. I DON'T DIFFER WITH YOU ON THAT. I THINK OUR DIFFERENCE IS HOW FAR WE DELVE INTO IT. IF I WASN'T CLEAR, I FELT I MADE THE COMMENT, BUT I AGREE THE OUT LINE THAT YOU REFERENCED, I THINK IS THE WORD, AND THAT THE CHAIR HAS SPOKEN TO, I AGREE WOULD BE A GOOD IDEA. WHAT ARE THE STEPS? FOR ANY NUMBER OF REASONS. SO IN THAT REGARDS, WEEDS OR NO WEEDS OR WHATEVER THE CASE IS I AGREE WITH YOU THERE. >> IF THERE IS NO OTHER COMMENT WE DON'T HAVE TO TAKE NECESSARILY A FORMAL MOTION, BUT WHAT WE WILL IS MOVE THIS AS AN ACTION ITEM FOR THE STAFF TO DO THIS FOR WHAT I WILL COMMIT US TO IS ENSURING THAT AS WE -- ONCE WE CRAFTED, THAT WE CREATE ENOUGH SPACE SO THAT THERE IS LIKE FEEDBACK AND DIALOGUE AND DISCUSSION, SO PLEASE BEAR WITH US THAT THIS MAY NOT HAPPEN OVERNIGHT, EITHER. AND SO GIVING US THAT TIME AND SPACE. AND I WOULD ASK, I'M GOING TO BE VERY PRACTICAL, BECAUSE I KNOW THESE TAKE A LOOK AT ONE OF THOSE APPENDIX PIECES THAT HAVE ALL OF OUR CONTRACTS, THERE IS GOING TO BE A FEW MORE CONTRACTS THAT ARE GOING TO BE TIMELY ACROSS THE NEXT COUPLE MONTHS. I'M GOING TO ASK THAT WE TRY TO DO THIS WORK QUICKLY BUT ALSO RECOGNIZE THAT WE MAY NOT BE DONE WITH THIS AS WE BEGIN TO MOVE THROUGH A FEW MORE CONTRACTS. I JUST WANT TO PUT THAT ON THE RECORD, LET US DO THIS WORK IN PARALLEL AND WE WILL CONTINUE TO TRY TO MAKE SURE THAT WE'RE GETTING INFORMATION TO YOU ALL AS EARLY AS POSSIBLE FOR OPPORTUNITIES FOR FEEDBACK AND QUESTIONS. WITH THAT, IF THERE ARE NO OTHER COMMENTS, OR IF EVERYONE IS IN GENERAL AGREEMENT, WE WILL CLOSE THAT ITEM AND NOTE IT AS A FUTURE ACTION ITEM THAT WE WILL BE

BRINGING BACK. WE ARE ON NEW ITEM, MICROSOFT TEAMS ITEM. THIS IS A REALLY IMPORTANT PIECE I WANTED TO MAKE SURE WE'RE TOUCHING ON. AND THAT WE WILL BE ABLE TO DO SOME ADDITIONAL FOLLOW UP. THIS IS ONE OF THINGS WE'RE TRYING TO INTO DUES IN RELATIONSHIP TO FIGURING OUT WAYS TO GET YOU ALL A LOT OF INFORMATION IN THE WAY THAT YOU CAN COME BACK TO IT AND UTILIZE IT OVER TIME. SO I'M TURNING THIS OVER TO COURTNEY FITZGERALD, WHO IS OVER COMMUNICATIONS FOR THE STATE EMPLOYEE HEALTH PLAN. >> YOU PROBABLY GET E-MAILS FROM ME ALL TIME. COURTNEY FITZGERALD, COMMUNICATIONS AND MARKETING MANAGER FOR THE STATE EMPLOYEE HEALTH PLAN. TODAY WE'RE GOING TO TALK A LITTLE BIT ABOUT MICROSOFT TEAMS. YOU MAY HAVE QUESTIONS ABOUT WHAT IS TEAMS, WHAT ARE WE PUTTING ON ON TEAMS, THOSE TYPE OF THINGS. IF YOU CAN MOVE TO NEXT ONE. SO MICROSOFT TEAMS IS A COLLABORATION PLATFORM. IT INCORPORATES PEOPLE, CONTENT, AND TOOLS, IN A SINGLE LOCATION. SOME OF YOU MAY HAVE UTILIZED MICROSOFT SHARE POINT BEFORE. YOU MAY HAVE USED ONE DRIVE, GOOGLE DRIVE. THEY'RE ALL VERY SIMILAR. MICROSOFT TEAMS IS JUST A MORE USER FRIENDLY TOOL THAT DOES THE SAME THING. IT ALLOWS YOU TO ACCESS FILES FROM A REMOTE LOCATION, BUT EVERYBODY CAN SEE THE EXACT SAME FILES AT THE SAME TIME FROM THEIR OWN PERSONAL COMPUTERS. MICROSOFT TEAMS IS AVAILABLE IN THREE DIFFERENT FORMATS. THERE IS A WEB PORTAL VERSION THAT YOU CAN LOG IN, JUST LIKE YOU WOULD FOR ZOOM, FOR INSTANCE, JUST THROUGH YOUR WEB BROWSER. THERE IS A DESK TOP APPLICATION, A FREE DOWNLOAD YOU CAN GET FROM MICROSOFT.COM. AND THERE IS ALL SIGH MOBILE APPLICATION VERSION SO YOU CAN ACADEMIC IS THINGS ON YOUR SMARTPHONE, BOTH APPLE OR ANDROID DEVICES. HOW IS THE HCC GOING TO USE MICROSOFT TEAMS. IN ORDER TO BE IN COMPLIANCE WITH, WE HAVE A LOT OF THE FEATURES IN TERMS OF COLLABORATION LOCKED DOWN SO WE DON'T INADVERTENTLY VIOLATE THE SERIAL COMMUNICATIONS REQUIREMENT. SO REALLY THE ONLY THING THAT WE HAVE ENABLED IS THE ABILITY



TO USE A FILE LIBRARY AND ACCESS THOSE FILES. WHAT IS ON THERE CURRENTLY TODAY ARE ALL OF OUR MEETING PACKETS AND FILES FROM ALL OF OUR PREVIOUS PUBLIC MEETINGS. ALL THOSE SAME FILES ARE CURRENTLY POSED TO THE HCC WEB PAGE, SO THE PUBLIC HAS ACCESS TO THEM, AS WELL. WHAT WE'RE ALSO LOOKING TO PUT ON HERE ARE SOME MORE PROPRIETARY INFORMATION ABOUT ONBOARDING PACKETS AND OTHER INFORMATION FROM CLOSED MEETINGS THAT ARE ONLY TRULY ACCESSIBLE TO THE HCC MEMBERS. THIS ALLOWS YOU TO ACCESS THOSE WHENEVER YOU NEED. YOU DON'T HAVE TO SIFT THROUGH MONTHS OF E-MAILS AND HOPE YOU TAG SOMETHING CORRECTLY. IT'S JUST GOING TO BE THERE FOR YOU. IF THERE ARE ITEMS THAT ARE NOT THERE OR ITEMS THAT ARE THERE THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO SEE SORTED DIFFERENTLY, PLEASE LET ME KNOW. I AM HAPPY TO ORGANIZE THINGS, ADD THINGS AS NECESSARY. THE NEXT ONE IS HOW DO I LOG IN. ESSENTIALLY ON OUR -- >> WOULD IT BE APPROPRIATE TO ASK QUESTIONS AS YOU GO OR WOULD YOU PREFER TO FINISH YOUR PRESENTATION? >> IF YOU HAVE A QUESTION YOU'RE WELCOME TO. >> GETTING BACK YOU WERE TALKING ABOUT FILES. IF I HEARD YOU, YOU SAID THE MEETING PACKETS WILL BE THERE. MY QUANDARY IS -- LET ME ASK. CAN I GO IN AND SAY STATE EMPLOYEE INSURANCE COST FOR LAST TEN YEARS, CAN I TRY TO GET A TITLE OF SOMETHING AND IT WILL TAKE ME TO THAT OR DO I HAVE TO KNOW I NEED TO GO TO THE APRIL 2021 MEETING, THAT'S WHERE WE GOT THAT INFORMATION? >> CURRENTLY I JUST HAVE THEM LISTED BY MEETING MONTH, BUT THAT DOES NOT MEAN THAT I CANNOT WHIZ THINGS SEPARATELY BY TOPICS. COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT MENTIONED SHE HAS ALL THE AGENDAS SAVED STATELY. SHE CAN FIND THEM THAT WAY, AS WELL. >> THAT COULD BE GROUPED IN A CERTAIN WAY, MYSELF, I THINK MANY OF US AT CERTAIN TIMES SAID I REMEMBER THIS DOCUMENT YOU ALL GAVE US LAST YEAR THAT HAD -- AND WE DESCRIBE THE DOCUMENT, RIGHT? SO I DO THINK THAT THE POTENTIAL HERE IS IF WE CAN GET ACTIVE AND UTILIZING IT, WE CAN PROVIDE FEEDBACK ON WHAT ARE WE SEARCHING FOR. WE CAN LEAVE

THEM BY MEETING, BUT THEN THERE ALSO COULD BE SOME TOPIC FOLDERS OF SOME THINGS THAT WE COME BACK TO OVER AND OVER AGAIN WHERE YOU CAN SEARCH IN BOTH WAYS. >> CORRECT. SO WE HAVE TWO DIFFERENT TYPES OF PEOPLE ON OUR COMMISSION. SO THERE ARE TWO SEPARATE WAYS THAT YOU CAN LOG IN TO TEAMS. SO ONE WAY, THIS WOULD BE APPROPRIATE FOR COMMISSIONER DECHANT AND, YOU ARE BOTH WHAT WE CONSIDER A GUEST IN OUR TEAMS ENVIRONMENT, WHICH MEANS YOU ARE NOT A MEMBER OF A STATE EMPLOYEE COMPUTER ENVIRONMENT. I LISTED HERE THE SPECIFIC WAYS TO LOG IN TO THE TEAMS. ESSENTIALLY EACH OF YOU SHOULD HAVE GOTTEN AN E-MAIL AT ONE POINT IN TIME THAT SAYS WELCOME, YOU'VE BEEN ADDED AS A GUEST TO MICROSOFT TEAMS SITE OR YOU'VE BEEN ADDED AS A MEMBER. IF YOU CAN'T FIND THOSE, IF YOU LOST IT OVER TIME, LET ME KNOW. I'M HAPPY TO WALK THROUGH THOSE PROCESSES WITH ALL OF YOU INDIVIDUALLY. IT'S THE LITTLE BIT DIFFERENT, BUT ONCE YOU GET INTO IT IT'S MUCH MORE INTUITIVE THAN TRYING TO NAVIGATE SHARE POINT. >> THIS IS COMMISSIONER BURNS WALLACE. I'M GOING TO ASK THAT AS -- AFTER WE GO THROUGH THIS THAT COURTNEY DO A FOLLOW UP WITH EACH INDIVIDUAL COMMISSIONER TO MAKE SURE THAT YOU HAVE WHAT YOU NEED TO ACCESS IT AND EVEN POTENTIALLY TO DO A SCREEN SHARE AND TO WALK YOU THROUGH NAVIGATING IT INITIALLY. AND I THINK THAT AT LEAST WILL GET US STARTED. AND SO THE -- A CHEAT SHEET BUT DON'T FEEL THAT YOU HAVE TO TRY TO NAVIGATE THIS ALONE. SHE IS JUST SHARING A LITTLE BIT, BRINGING IT BACK TO THE FOREFRONT AND WANTING US TO CONTINUE TO REALLY USE IT AND TRY TO ENGAGE IT. >> EXACTLY. THERE IS ALSO A LINK INCLUDED ON THE BOTTOM OF THIS PAGE IF YOU WANT TO WATCH A TUTORIAL. FOR THOSE OF YOU THAT ARE STATE MOMMIES, IT IS MUCH EASIER TO LOG IN AND ACCESS. IT'S JUST LIKE YOU WOULD OPEN UP OUTLOOK ON YOUR COMPUTER, AN APP, A DECEMBER TOP APP FOR MICROSOFT TEAMS. IF THAT'S NOT INSTALLED IT'S EASY TO GET THAT INSTALLED AND SUPER EASY TO ACCESS FROM THERE. AND YOU WILL SEE THE TEAM ON

THE LEFT-HAND SIDE ONCE YOU LOG IN. >> I HAVE ANOTHER QUESTION. >> YES. >> STEVE DECHANT. IF I GO BACK BETWEEN SAY TABLET AND DESK TOP COMPUTER, I TAKE IT WE'RE JUST LOOKING AT INFORMATION, SO NOT LIKE -- SO WE CAN BE WORKING ON ONE COMPONENT ONE POINT IN TIME AND ANOTHER COMPONENT THE OTHER AND GETTING TO THE SAME STUFF. >> YES. THERE IS AN APP THAT YOU CAN DOWNLOAD FOR YOUR TABLET, AS WELL, SO YOU CAN ACCESS THE FILES EASILY. I USE THE ONE ON MY MOBILE DEVICE ALL THE TIME TO ACCESS FILES AND EASILY SHARE THINGS BACK AND FORTH. IT'S A LITTLE BIT SMALLER ON MY PHONE THAN A COMPUTER BUT -- >> I WOULD LIKE THE SAY, VICKI SCHMIDT, I WOULD LIKE TO SAY THIS IS TO HER YOUTH THAT SHE CAN USE THIS ON HER PHONE. >> YOU CAN ZOOM REALLY BIG ON YOUR PHONE. >> NOT BIG ENOUGH. >> SO IN TERMS OF ONCE YOU GET IN THERE, I INCLUDED A SCREEN SHOT OF WHERE TO FIND THE FILES. AND THE HIGHLIGHTED SOME THINGS IN RED. IT REALLY WILL MEAN NOTHING UNTIL YOU'RE ACTUALLY IN THERE ACTIVELY LOOKING AT WHAT THE SCREEN IS AND WHERE TO GO. ONCE YOU USED IT A COUPLE TIMES, IT'S MUCH EASIER TO ACCESS THINGS IN HERE. IT ALLOWS US TO DO THINGS OTHER THAN FILE, AS WELL. THERE IS A LITTLE TAB IF YOU SEE ON THE ILLUSTRATION THAT SAYS WICKY. WICKY IS I REALLY JUST -- IT'S A LIST OF APPROPRIATE HYPER LINKS FOR YOU TO ACCESS THINGS FOR SO YOU DON'T HAVE TO SEARCH THROUGH OUR WEBSITE TO TRY FIND WHERE THOSE ARE AT. WHERE DO I LEARN MORE. I INCLUDED A LINK TO WATCH A DOME ON THERE. IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS OR GET STUCK ON SOMETHING FEEL FREE TO GIVE ME A CALL, SEND ME AN E-MAIL I'M HAPPY TO COME MEET WITH YOU ALL IN PERSON. IT'S A FUN TOOL. I'VE REALLY GOTTEN TO BE ABLE TO USE IT MUCH BETTER OVER THE PAST YEAR. IT WAS ONE OF THOSE THINGS THAT COVID KIND OF FORCED UPON ALL OF US TO WORK REMOTELY AND IT HAS BEEN AN AMAZING TOOL. UNFORTUNATELY WE CAN'T USE IT FOR ALL OF ITS ABILITIES BECAUSE OF THE NATURE OF OUR WORK AND OUR BODY, BUT IN PRIVATE WORK IT ALLOWS YOU TO DO VIDEO CALLS, AND MESSAGING BACK AND

FORTH, AND THOSE TYPES OF COLLABORATIVE COMMUNICATIONS. IT'S JUST WITH THIS GROUP WE CAN'T DO THOSE BECAUSE WE WOULD INADVERTENTLY VIOLATE. >> I HAVE ANOTHER QUESTION. >> YES. COMMISSIONER DECHANT. >> YES. STEVE DID HE CHANT. ONCE I GONE IN AND STARTED LOOKING STUFF UP, DOES IT KEEP KIND OF A HISTORY OF WHAT I'VE LOOKED AT? AND TO GET BACK TO MY FIRST QUESTION, IT WOULD BE A WAY OF LOOKING SOMETHING UP, GOING BACK TO IT REAL EASY IF THERE IS A HISTORY OR FREQUENTLY USED FILES KIND OF -- >> IT DOES HAVE A RECENTLY VIEWED SECTION IN THERE. I THINK IF YOU SCROLL UP TO THE ONE THAT HAD THE RED CIRCLE AROUND THINGS. YUP, THAT ONE. ON THE LEFT-HAND SIDE OF THAT SCREEN, THERE IS A LITTLE LOGO THAT SAYS FILES. AND IF YOU CLICK THAT IT WILL HAVE A HISTORY OF RECENT FILES THAT YOU HAD VIEWED. YUP. >> I GUESS THE QUESTION I'M ASKING PROBABLY WOULD BE BEST ANSWERED IF I GET IN AND WORK WITH IT, RIGHT? >> YES, AND I'M HAPPY TO DO THAT. >> ONE OF MY QUESTIONS IS AROUND WE LIMITED THE FUNCTIONALITY, IS VIEW ONLY, SO LET'S SAY I WANTED TO CREATE MY OWN FOLDER AND COPY SOME THINGS, SO IT WOULD BE ONLY -- >> YES, IT IS VIEW ONLY. YOU CAN'T BREAK ANYTHING, SO EVEN IF YOU DO MANAGE TO BE ABLE TO CHANGE SOMETHING, I CAN ONLY GO BACK AND REVERT TO THE PREVIOUS VERSION. SO IF YOU ACCIDENTALLY DELETE SOMETHING OR FOLDER I CAN FIND THEM. BUT I DO THAT ABILITY LOCKED DOWN. >> CAN YOU PRINT? >> YES. YOU CAN PRINT. YOU CAN SAVE A COPY TO YOUR DESK TOP, AS WELL. SO THAT IS SUPER HELPFUL. >> THAT IS IT. SO BEING ABLE TO SAVE A COPY TO YOUR DESK TOP, ONE OF THE TECHNIQUES WE MIGHT USE IS THINKING ABOUT THE CREATE YOURSELF A FOLDER ON YOUR OWN COMPUTER WHERE YOU'RE PULLING CERTAIN THINGS THAT YOU DROP, OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT. SOMETIMES I THINK AS COMMISSIONER DID HE CHANT, THERE ARE THINGS LIKE I WANT TO GO BACK TO MULTIPLE TIMES AND SO EITHER LEARNING WHERE THEY ARE QUICKLY IN THERE, OR AWAY FROM ME TO ACCESS IT. I USE THE COMMISSIONERS ONCE WE GET IN HERE AND PLAY WITH IT AND UTILIZE IT AND

THEY START TO POPULATE IT THE STRONGEST PIECE IS IF WE UTILIZE IT AND IF WE PROVIDE FEEDBACK. SO IF YOU RUN INTO SOMETHING, PLEASE DON'T HESITATE TO ASK OR TO SAY CAN IT DO THIS OR CAN WE THINK ABOUT DOING THIS OR THIS WOULD BE HELPFUL FOR ME, AS I'M LOOKING FOR INFORMATION. WITH TWO NEW COMMISSIONERS COMING ON 8 A GREAT OPPORTUNITY, BECAUSE THEY CAN GIVE US FRESH EYES TO SOME OF THIS AS WE START TO UTILIZE THIS TOOL. BUT AGAIN COMMISSIONERS, I AM 100% COMMITTED TO US BEING INFORMED IN WHICHEVER AND HOWEVER WE CAN DO THIS. AND WE ALL EXPRESSED JUST THE AMOUNT OF PAPER AND MATERIALS THAT WE TO GO THROUGH. SO I'M HOPING THIS WILL HELP US. IT WON'T END ALL OF THAT BUT IT WILL GIVE US A LITTLE BIT OF ROOM AND NAVIGATION. SO LET'S TRY IT AND THEN IF WE NEED TO DO MORE OR DIFFERENT WE HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO DO SO. ANY OTHER QUESTIONS, COMMISSIONERS? THANK YOU, COURTNEY SOUR

LAST ITEM IS OTHER BUSINESS. I HAVE A COUPLE ITEMS THEN I'LL CHECK IN WITH COMMISSIONERS TO SEE IF YOU ALL HAVE ANY -- ONE THING COMING UP, I BELIEVE OUR NEXT MEETING ON THE BOOKS TRADITIONALLY IS IN SEPTEMBER, LATE AUGUST, SEPTEMBER. HOWEVER, COMMISSIONERS, THERE IS THINGS THAT WE'VE TALKED ABOUT AND IF YOU REMEMBER WE CIRCULATED KIND OF A PLANNED KIND OF THROUGHOUT THE REST OF THE YEAR. ONE OF THE THINGS THAT WE'RE GOING TO WANT TO TACKLE SOMETIME THIS SUMMER IS AROUND THE WELLNESS PROGRAM. AND BEING ABLE TO DO WHAT WE TALKED ABOUT IN TERMS OF A MORE OF A DEEP DIVE, AND UNDERSTANDING OF IT. IT IS ONE OF THE MAJOR CONTRACTS THAT WE'LL NEED TO GO OUT LATER THIS YEAR FOR NEXT YEAR. AND SO THIS IS AN ATTEMPT TO GET US AHEAD OF THAT, TO BE ABLE TO DO THAT DEEP DIVE, TO UNDERSTAND IT, TO THINK ABOUT WHAT WE WANT TO CRAFT INTO IT, AND TO GIVE US ENOUGH RUNWAY WITH WHETHER IT'S THE RFP OR THAT PROCESS SO THAT WE AREN'T RUNNING UP AGAINST A MAJOR DEADLINE. BUT WE'VE BEEN TALKING ABOUT DOING A WELLNESS FEEDBACK FOR A WHILE. SO THAT IS A -- THAT WILL BE SOMETHING THAT WE

WANT TO TALK ABOUT AND CREATE SPACE FOR. WE ALSO HAVE I THINK AT LEAST ONE -- THANK YOU. SO THE ACTUAL AERIAL CONTRACT, THE TIMING OF IT IS NOT GOING TO ALLOW US TO WAIT ALL THE WAY TO SEPTEMBER SO THAT WE DON'T WALK INTO THE SEPTEMBER MEETING AND BE BEHIND THE LINE ON IT. OUR CONTRACT AS A REMINDER THAT IS SEGAL CURRENTLY. THEY'RE THE CURRENT PROVIDER. BUT THAT IS ONE OF THE THAT WE'RE GOING TO NEED TO LOOK AT SOMETIME THIS SUMMER AND CAN'T WAIT OR DON'T WANT TO WAIT ALL THE WAY TO SEPTEMBER AND PUT I IN A BIND OR UNDER THAT PRESSURE. SO GO AHEAD, JANET. >> THAT REALLY NEEDS TO BE JULY. >> SO WE WILL TRY TO CREATE SPACE JUST -- THIS IS THE OTHER THING THAT I -- AT SOME POINT WE MAY NEED TO LOOK AT. THIS HAS TRADITIONALLY BEEN A COMMITTEE I THINK THAT MET MORE QUARTERLY, BUT AS WE HAVE DONE MORE WORK AT A CERTAIN POINT IN TIME WE JUST MAY NEED TO ADJUST THAT TO BE ABLE TO ADDRESS MAYBE IN SHORTER OR SMALLER BITES SOME OF OUR WORK THROUGHOUT THE YEAR. I DON'T HAVE SUGGESTIONS RIGHT NOW BUT I'M JUST TRYING TO MAKE SURE WE'RE CREATING SPACE TO PUT STUFF IN FRONT OF US SOONER RATHER THAN LATER AND NOT BE UP AGAINST MAJOR DEADLINES. I THINK THAT'S ALL I HAVE IN MY OTHER BUSINESS. COMMISSIONERS, ARE THERE ANY ITEMS THAT ARE -- THAT WOULD BE NEW BUSINESS ITEMS THAT YOU WOULD LIKE US TO TAKE UP FOR A FUTURE MEETING? THIS IS THAT OPPORTUNITY TO THROW THOSE IN. COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT. >> THANK YOU. I GOT -- I THOUGHT I UNDERSTOOD THE MARATHON CONTRACT WAS ALSO UP AT THE END OF THIS YEAR. SO IT WILL ALL SOMEBODY PART OF NECESSARY SUMMER CONVERSATION. >> YOU'RE CORRECT. >> SO WITH MARATHON DO WE NEED TO SET A MEETING DATE FOR JULY? ON DO YOU WANT TO SEND OUT SOME DATES? >> YES. SO COMMISSIONERS CAN WE REACH OUT TO YOU AND SEND OUT SOME DATES? THIS IS -- I KNOW THIS IS VACATION TIME, SO THAT WILL BE VERY IMPORTANT TO SEE WHAT THE WINDOW IS FOR THAT. SO I ANTICIPATE WE WILL HAVE A JULY MEETING. IT WILL ALSO ALLOW US TO HAVE OUR NEW COMMISSIONERS AS

PART OF THESE CONVERSATIONS. I THINK THEY WILL BE EXCITED TO BE PART OF THE CONVERSATION BOTH ABOUT WELLNESS AND ABOUT MARATHON. >> I'LL JUST -- I'M OUT THE WEEK OF THE 12th OF JULY. >> THE WE'RE DOING THAT -- >> GO AHEAD. >> YOU'RE NEXT USUALLY BECAUSE OF YOUR BUSY SCHEDULE, SO -- >> I'M HERE FOR THE MONTH OF JULY. >> APPRECIATE. >> I'M AROUND. >> WE'LL GATHER THAT INFORMATION. THANK YOU. >> IT WILL -- I AM AROUND AND CAN MOVE THINGS AROUND TO ACCOMMODATE THIS. SO I'M -- WE'LL HAVE THE TEAM REACH OUT AND GRAB YOUR VACATIONS IN PARTICULAR, ANY OTHER BUSINESSES? ANY OTHER ITEMS? >> NOT WANTING TO REOPEN PROTECTED DISCUSSION BUT I FELT THAT WE DIDN'T RESOLVE -- I DON'T WANT TO TRY TO RESOLVE IT NOW, BUT I WANT TO -- THAT WE DID NOT RESOLVE THE 2218 ISSUE. IT WAS TALKED ABOUT, BUT I DON'T -- I THOUGHT THERE WAS RESOLUTION. SO I WOULD LIKE TO COME BACK TO IT AND MAKE A POINT TO RESOLVE OR AT LEAST DISCUSS AND WORK TOWARDS RESOLUTION OF THAT. >> WE WILL ADD THAT, AND I WILL SAY THAT WE MAY NOT ADD IT -- LET ME TRY TO BE CLEAR. WE MAY NOT ADD IT AT THE JULY, MAY BE AT OUR STANDING SEPTEMBER TO GIVE THE NEW COMMISSIONERS TIME TO GET IN AND TWO SO IF WE'RE ABLE TO KEEP THE JULY MEETING SHORTER TO KIND OF MOVE THROUGH SOME THINGS, SO WE WILL MAKE SURE THAT IT HITS ONE OF OUR UPCOMING MEETINGS BEFORE WE GET TOO FAR OUT. >> AND WE HAVE A MEETING FOR THE PUBLIC HEARING. CAN THOSE BE DONE IN THE SAME DAY? >> I THINK THEY CAN. AND ACTUALLY, THAT -- I'M GOING TO -- YES, THE PUBLIC MEETING DATE HAS MOVED OUT, AND IT IS AN AGENDA ITEM. I WANT TO MAKE SURE EVERYBODY HAS CONTEXT ON THAT. WE COULD COMBINATION THOSE ON THE SAME DATE IF IT WORKS FOR EVERYONE'S SCHEDULE. WITH THAT I'M GOING TO MOVE US INTO OLD BUSINESS. ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS OR ITEMS. YOU RECEIVED THE ITEMS. SOME OF THOSE WE TALKED THROUGH. IS THERE ANYTHING OUTSTANDING OR ANY QUESTIONS IN THAT PACKET, COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT? >> THANK YOU MADAM CHAIR. I DO HAVE ONE QUESTION. ON THE FOLLOW UP AND

REPORT TO COMMISSION REGARDING PAYMENT FROM THE PHARMACY AUDIT, I SEE THAT THE AGREEMENT WAS REACHED ON 5/17/21. I GUESS YOU KNOW THE PHARMACY AUDIT WAS PRESENTED TO THE STATE OF KANSAS ON MARCH 26th, 2021. AND THEN THE FOLLOW UP STATES THE AGREEMENT WAS REACHED ON 5/17/21. I GUESS I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHAT AGREEMENT? WHAT DID WE AGREE TO? YOU KNOW, THE CHECK -- I MEAN WAS IT A CONVERSATIONAL AGREEMENT? OR WAS IT A WRITTEN AGREEMENT? AND HOW DID WE -- THE CHECK WAS FOR \$110,833.81. HOW WAS THAT AMOUNT REACHED? WAS IT STRICTLY OUT OF THE AUDIT? I JUST HAVE QUESTIONS. >> WELL, THIS IS JANET. WHEN THOSE AUDITS ARE RECEIVED, THERE IS A TIME GAP WHERE WE ALL HAVE TO REVIEW IT. THEN WE HAVE TO SCHEDULE MEETINGS TO DISCUSS. WE USE SEEING ALL AT TIMES TO VALIDATE SOME OF THE INFORMATION, AND IN THIS CASE OUR OUTSIDE AUDITOR WE VALIDATE THE MONIES THAT WERE RECEIVED AND THERE IS FINANCIAL ANALYSIS DONE AND SO FORTH. SO I'M PARAPHRASING BUT THERE IS A LOT OF STUFF THAT GOES ON IN BETWEEN THE TIME THAT THE AUDIT GETS RECEIVED AND THAT WE HAVE ANOTHER DISCUSSION, AND WE REVIEW IT WITH THE VENDOR ONLINE. AND SO FORTH, WHICH WE DID. WITH THE AUDITOR, THAT IS. THE FINAL AMOUNT IS IN WRITTEN FORM, THAT'S CORRECT. AND THAT THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT WE AGREE TO IS WHAT IS REFERRED TO IN THE 5/17, AS FAR AS THE AGREEMENT ON THE -- WHAT THE MONIES OWED WOULD BE. SO YES. >> I THINK THAT'S NOT MY QUESTION. MY QUESTION IS WHAT -- DID YOU NEGOTIATE ON IT OR -- >> WE DON'T NEGOTIATE. >> SO WE -- >> I GUESS -- IT'S A TERM I GUESS WE VALIDATE THAT WHAT WE'RE BEING TOLD IS CORRECT, AND NOW I'LL TURN TO MIKE SINCE HE'S GONE THROUGH SOME OF THESE. MIKE, DO YOU WANT TO ADD TO WHAT I'M SAYING? >> MY QUESTION IS, I DID NOT GO BACK AND -- I RAN OUT OF TIME, MY FAULT, I WANTED TO GO BACK AND -- IS THE \$110,833.81 THE AMOUNT THAT WAS IN THE REPORT THAT THE -- THAT WAS SUBMITTED THAT THE AUDIT -- THAT CAME TO US AND THE -- ON THE MARCH 26th, 21 REPORT. FAN NOT, THEN WHERE DID WE --



HOW DID -- WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN -- WHAT WAS THE -- >> I'M SORRY. I DIDN'T UNDERSTAND YOUR QUESTION. >> THAT'S OKAY. THAT'S MY QUESTION. SO THAT WOULD -- BECAUSE THAT WOULD FLOW INTO WHAT WAS THE AGREEMENT. >> OKAY. OKAY. >> THANK YOU. NO IT'S -- DON'T APOLOGIZE. I DIDN'T ASK THE QUESTION RIGHT. THANK YOU. >> SO WE WILL MARK THAT AS A FOLLOW UP. >> MIKE MICHAEL. NOT THE EXACT AMOUNTS, BUT THE AUDITOR REMITS THE INITIAL REPORT TO GO OVER TO THE HEALTH PLAN, AND THEN THE QUESTIONS WE MAY HAVE, AND THE VENDORS BROUGHT IN TO GET OVER THE REPORT AND THE VENDOR HAS AN OPPORTUNITY TO RESPOND. THE NUMBERS ALL COME FROM THE AUDIT RECORD. IT JUST DEPENDS ON THE RESPONSES ON WHERE THE FINAL NUMBER LANDS. >> ALL RIGHT. IF WE CAN FOLLOW UP AND MAKE SURE IN NEXT PACKET THAT WE ADDRESS AND ALLOW THAT. OKAY. ANYTHING ELSE WITH THE FOLLOW-UP ITEM? COMMISSIONERS? ALL RIGHT. OUR LAST OLD BUSINESS ITEM IS ACTUALLY THE RULES AND REGULATIONS CHANGE UPDATE. WE HAD PUBLIC HEARING, APOLOGIES, I WAS LOOKING FOR IT SHOULD WORKS A PUBLIC HEARING THAT WAS SUPPOSED TO BE SCHEDULED YEAR. I'M GOING TO ASK LEGAL COUNSEL TO SHARE WHY WE HAD TO SHIFT THAT WITH SHORT NOTICE. >> SEVERAL MONTHS AGOS APART OF THE ADOPTION PROCESS FOR REGULATIONS, THERE IS A NOISE REQUIRED TO BE PUBLISHED AT TIME AND LOCATION OF PUBLIC HEARING. DURING THE PANDEMIC THERE WERE SPECIAL REGULATIONS IN WAY BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL THAT ALLOWED FOR VIRTUAL MEETINGS TO OCCUR AND WE'RE STILL IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE OPEN MEETINGS ACT. SO TUESDAY AT MIDNIGHT I BELIEVE THE PANDEMIC ENDED AND SO WITH THAT I BELIEVE THE ATTORNEY GENERAL WAS ON WIVR SAYING SO ARE THE REGS, THEY'RE AGAIN TOO. THERE WAS SOME CONCERN ABOUT THE NEED TO CHANGE PUBLIC MEETINGS GOING FORWARD. WE THOUGHT IT WAS BEST LIKELY TO REDO OUR PUBLIC HEARING AND ALLOW PEOPLE TO COME IN PERSON IF THEY WANT TO SO WE DON'T DISENFRANCHISE ANYBODY. IT WILL GIVE US ADDITIONAL TIME TO GATHER PUBLIC COMMENT. BUT

THAT WOULD JUST ADDRESS THAT. SO WE'LL -- THE TRADITIONAL, ALL THE ONES I'VE DONE UP TO NOW HAVE BEEN IN PERSON AND I THINK THE MANUAL TALKS ABOUT HAVING A PHYSICAL SIGN UP SHEET, SO YOU HAVE A RECORD OF EVERYBODY CAME AND ATTENDED THE PUBLIC HEARING. NOT THAT YOU COULDN'T MAKE A RECORD IN A VIRTUAL ONE, OBVIOUSLY CAN, SOMETIMES THAT'S MORE DIFFICULT WHEN PEOPLE COME IN, BUT IF YOU SET IT UP RIGHT YOU CAN DO THAT. THAT'S WHY WE DO THAT. >> SO WE HAVE MOVED OUR DATE OUT. >> CORRECT. >> WE'RE STILL DOING IT, EVERYTHING IS STILL IN PLACE, THE WORLD JUST HAPPENED AROUND THIS PARTICULAR MEETING AND THERE WAS WITH THAT EXPIRATION OF THE EMERGENCY DECLARATION AND THEN THE RESCINDING OF THOSE REGS, IT -- THERE WAS ENOUGH CONCERN THAT WAS RAISED THAT WE WOULDN'T BE ABLE TO HOLD THE PUBLIC HEARING FOLLOWING ALL OF THE NECESSARY GUIDELINES. SO COMMISSIONERS PLEASE BEAR WITH US, BUT WE'RE STILL DOING THAT WORK AND STILL ENSURING THAT WE GET TO OUR END GOAL AND THAT IS. ANY QUESTIONS FOR JOHN OR THE STAFF AROUND THE RULE AND REG CHANGE? >> I DON'T THINK IT'S SUPPOSED TO HAPPEN. IT WILL. >> IT WILL. AS THE COMMISSION HAS SAID THAT IT IS IMPORTANT TO OUR EMPLOYEES. SO WITH THAT, COMMISSIONERS, ARE THERE ANY OTHER ISSUES BEFORE US? HEARING NONE, I MOVE TO ADJOURN THE JUNE 18th STATE EMPLOYEE HEALTHCARE COMMISSION. THANK YOU COMMISSIONERS AND WE WILL BE BACK IN TOUCH SOON.