

ARIZONA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Fiftieth Legislature – First Regular Session

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND INSURANCE

Minutes of Meeting
Monday, February 14, 2011
House Hearing Room 5 -- 2:00 p.m.

Chairman McLain called the meeting to order at 2:57 p.m. and attendance was noted by the secretary.

Members Present

Ms. McCune Davis
Mr. Miranda R
Mr. Seel

Mr. Smith D
Mr. Williams

Mr. Dial, Vice-Chairman
Mrs. McLain, Chairman

Members Absent

None

Committee Action

HB2221 - Discussion Only
HB2412 - DPA (5-2-0-0)
HB2616 - DP (6-0-0-1)

HB2617 - DP (5-1-0-1)
HB2666 - DPA (4-2-0-1)

CONSIDERATION OF BILLS

HB2221 - establishment; bank of Arizona - DISCUSSION ONLY

Representative John Fillmore, sponsor, stated that HB2221 creates the Bank of Arizona (Attachment 1). Small businesses are the backbone of this country and play a vital role in the economy. In the current economic climate, most banks are not lending to small businesses. The large banks are capable of making loans but only lend if the applicant has 50 percent down and a high credit score. He said he believes the federal government will continue to tighten the rules and regulations on the federal level and if Arizona has a state bank, it will enable the state to aid the small entrepreneur, free up capital and make necessary loans. In addition, it could aid other Arizona financial institutions by providing loan guarantees, enabling the small banks to pool their money. He maintained that this proposal is worthy of discussion and worthy of moving forward.

In response to Mr. Seel, Representative Fillmore reiterated that it is difficult for small businesses to put 50 percent down as a condition of being granted a loan. This proposal will enable smaller

banks to provide more loans to small businesses. Small banks will be given a guarantee by the state bank enabling them to play at the same level as the larger federal banks.

Mr. Seel asked whether a state bank will have a positive impact on the state's General Fund. Representative Fillmore answered that this will allow Arizonans to start their own businesses and be able to produce. It will send a message to other states that Arizona is open for business.

Mr. Smith noted that the bill authorizes the state bank to loan money to the General Fund if the balance in the General Fund is insufficient to meet Legislative appropriations. He wondered whether that encourages deficit spending by the Legislature. Representative Fillmore replied in the negative. He explained that the provisions of the bill will enable the state bank to make loans which would be guaranteed by the state. The bank will be administered by a group appointed by the Governor, the Treasurer's Office and the Legislature, who would have oversight. It does not put the state at risk, and can create a cash-generating mechanism that the state can use. Mr. Smith again commented that if the state needs funds, it can go to a bank now to request a loan. Representative Fillmore commented that this bank will be capitalized by private individuals making an investment in the state.

Scott Powell, Economic Development Coordinator, Town of Florence, representing self, in support of HB2221, testified that access to capital is crucial in economic development. He said that some of the larger institutions will not make a loan unless it is for \$100,000 because the cost is too high to process a smaller loan. He commented that economic development in Arizona is difficult. A proposal like this can create jobs, especially at the local level in rural Arizona.

Wendy Briggs, representing Arizona Bankers Association, spoke in opposition to HB2221. The bill's goal is to provide capital to small- and medium-sized businesses in the form of loans through a state bank. She expressed concerns about the risk of using taxpayer funds and also because there is no lending going on. She related that Arizona small businesses have received over \$5 billion in loans in the last few years. The question is whether a state bank is needed to do that lending; she submitted that it is not needed because of the number of financial institutions in Arizona that are able to make good loans to businesses

Chairman McLain announced the names of those who signed up in opposition to HB2221 but did not speak:

Craig McDermott, representing self

Austin De Bey, Vice President of Government Affairs, Arizona Credit Union League

Chairman McLain announced the names of those who signed up as neutral on HB2221 but did not speak:

James Stabler, Chief Counsel, SCF Arizona

Mr. Smith asked the Treasurer's position on this bill.

Kevin Donnellan, Director of Communications, Arizona Treasurer's Office, advised that the creation of a state bank will be a tremendous undertaking for all branches of government. He said this just does not seem like the time to pursue this endeavor.

HB2412 - credit card agreements. - DO PASS AMENDED

Vice-Chairman Dial moved that HB2412 do pass.

Brooke Olguin, Majority Research Analyst, advised that HB2412 adds credit card debt to the type of debt that must be prosecuted within six years after a cause of action accrues (Attachment 2). The bill clarifies that the last payment date is the date of accrual; however, if no payment occurs, the charge-off date serves as the date of accrual. In addition, the bill asserts that a credit card or other revolving debt agreement that is entered into with a resident of Arizona is governed by the laws of Arizona.

Vice-Chairman Dial moved that the McLain nine-line amendment dated 2/11/11 be adopted (Attachment 3).

Ms. Olguin explained that the McLain nine-line amendment dated 2/11/11 clarifies that credit card has the same meaning as defined in the criminal code statute, deletes the date of accrual in two sections of the bill and stipulates that if there is a conflict between another jurisdiction and this state relating to the statute of limitations, this section applies (Attachment 3).

Ms. McCune Davis moved that the McCune Davis nine-line amendment dated 2/3/11 be adopted (Attachment 4).

It was noted that one amendment has already been moved.

Ms. McCune Davis withdrew her motion that the McCune Davis nine-line amendment dated 2/3/11 be adopted (Attachment 4).

Ms. McCune Davis explained that there is a distinction in law about what controls credit card contracts and other contracts. Credit card contracts have a six-year statute of limitations; other contracts have a three-year statute of limitations. The McLain amendment applies both to the six-year statute of limitations. The McCune Davis amendment, which favors consumers, offers an alternative to letting nonwritten contracts remain at three years.

Representative Jim Weiers, sponsor, said he understands that the discussion is whether to leave the legislation as it is currently.

Ms. McCune Davis asked why this Legislature would want to subject consumers to an additional three years of collections. Representative Weiers answered that the shorter time period invites the likelihood of being sued; the longer the time period, the better the chance is for resolution and lack of lawsuit. The reason for the proposed legislation is there is ambiguity and confusion in the law. This legislation clarifies the law. Ms. McCune Davis related that she has information that suggests that the statute of limitations for written contracts is six years and three years for other contracts. She does not disagree with Representative Weiers' comment that there is ambiguity in the law; however, she does disagree with the need to take all contracts to six years and tie it to Arizona law. She said consumers will be subjected to three additional years of collection.

Mr. Smith said he understands this bill only changes the statute of limitations for credit cards and ensures that a credit card is a written contract and has the same limitation as other written contracts. Mr. Weiers concurred. He reiterated that a vast majority of the Justices of the Peace (JP) interpret this as six years. He disagreed with Ms. McCune Davis that changing the law to three years is better for consumers.

Mr. Miranda queried whether these are companies that are buying old debts. Representative Weiers deferred that question to the attorney who will testify. Mr. Miranda stated that he wants to ensure that this bill is not for companies that buy old debt. He mentioned that it is difficult to keep records for some years after a debt is paid off. To that point, Representative Weiers stated that it is not up to a person to prove anything; it is up to the company to prove that the debt is owned. He mentioned that a collection firm and its clients are open to litigation if a false claim of debt is made.

Richard Reed, representing self, in support of HB2412, advised that he is a collection attorney. He agreed with Representative Weiers that shortening the time frame will encourage more lawsuits and flood the justice courts.

Ms. McCune Davis asked what the statute of limitations on collections is in Delaware. Mr. Reed said he does not know.

Ms. McCune Davis again disputed the claim that a shorter time period will encourage more lawsuits. She maintained that this proposal exposes the consumer to a collection period of six years rather than reaching a resolution to the problem. Mr. Reed mentioned that other states have different limitations; he noted some have ten-year statutes of limitations.

Clancy Jayne, Judge, representing self, in support of HB2412, testified that he is a Justice of the Peace (JP). He advised that the bench has chosen not to take a position on this bill. His personal position is that there is confusion on this issue that needs to be clarified. He maintained that this proposal will take away confusion on the credit card debt issue and will benefit consumers.

Ms. McCune Davis brought up a hypothetical case of a consumer who has a credit card issued in Delaware. Based on Delaware law, the statute of limitations for collections is four years. She asked whether the court would be required to honor the lawsuit filed in court or dismiss it based on the fact that it was filed beyond the statute of limitations. Judge Jayne declined to answer because he said several things would have to be taken into consideration.

Chairman McLain announced the names of those who signed up in opposition to HB2412 but did not speak:

Jay Kaprosy, Senior Government Relations Advisor, Arizona Bankers Association
Kelly Griffith, Deputy Director, representing self

Chairman McLain announced the names of those who signed up as neutral on the amendment to HB2412 but did not speak:

Wendy Briggs, representing Arizona Bankers Association

Question was called on the motion that the McLain nine-line amendment dated 2/11/11 be adopted (Attachment 3). The motion carried.

Vice-Chairman Dial moved that HB2412 as amended do pass. The motion carried by a roll call vote of 5-2-0-0 (Attachment 5).

HB2616 - workers' compensation; controlled substances - DO PASS

Vice-Chairman Dial moved that HB2616 do pass.

Jennifer Londono, Majority Intern, advised that HB2616 specifies requirements for dispensing controlled substances to injured workers (Attachment 6).

James Stabler, Chief Counsel, SCF Arizona, testified in support of HB2616. He related that current law, passed in 2009, is very effective; it requires a physician to justify use of heavy narcotic medications approved by the Food and Drug Administration (FDS) for intervention with terminally-ill cancer patients. Prior to that, these heavy narcotic drugs were being prescribed for back conditions, headaches, and a variety of conditions that did not merit such heavy narcotics use. He spoke of the toll that over-prescription of narcotics takes on people. HB2616 requires physicians to document the dispensing of these controlled substances to injured workers. This bill does not deny benefits; it just requires the prescribing physician to justify the prescription of that drug and to demonstrate that it is helping the injured worker.

In response to Mr. Seel's questions, Mr. Stabler said he believes that this legislation will have a direct impact on the misuse of these drugs. People will not be able to get multiple prescriptions written by different physicians for the same condition because of the requirement for a physician to report, thus reducing the amount of narcotics that can be sold. On the national level, abuse of multiple prescriptions to the workers' compensation system runs in the hundreds of millions of dollars.

Chairman McLain announced the names of those who signed up in support of HB2616 but did not speak:

Farrell Quinlan, State Director, National Federation of Independent Business
Michelle Bolton, Vice President of Public Affairs, Greater Phoenix Chamber of Commerce
David Childers, Lobbyist, Property Casualty Insurers; Liberty Mutual Group
Mike Colletto, Executive Director, Community Horizons
Lori Lustig, Tucson Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce
Wendy Briggs, Lobbyist, American Insurance Association
Kerry Hayden, Government Affairs Representative, Farmers Insurance Group of Companies
Jeff Gray, Legislative Liaison, Arizona Self-Insurers Association (ASIA)
J. Michael Low, Attorney, American Family
George Diaz, Senior Public Affairs Representative, Arizona Public Service
Lorna Romero, Director of Government Relations, Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry
Michael Preston Green, Lobbyist, Catalyst Paper (Snowflake) Inc., Southwest Airlines
Heather Bernacki, Government Relations Associate, East Valley Chambers of Commerce Alliance

Chairman McLain announced the names of those who signed up opposition to HB2616 but did not speak:

Janice Goldstein, Arizona Trial Lawyers Association

Question was called on the motion that HB2616 do pass. The motion carried by a roll call vote of 6-0-0-1 (Attachment 7).

HB2617 - workers' compensation; settlement of claims - DO PASS

Vice-Chairman Dial moved that HB2617 do pass.

Jennifer Londono, Majority Intern, explained that HB2617 allows parties of a claim to settle all or part of the claim and to agree to a *full and final settlement* of the claim upon the approval of the Industrial Commission of Arizona (ICA) (Attachment 8). The bill defines *full and final settlement* as a settlement in which the injured worker waives any future entitlement to benefits on the claim and waives any future right to reopen or rearrange the claim.

Wendy Briggs, American Insurance Association, in support of HB2617, stated that this bill creates the ability for workers to fully and finally settle their workers' compensation claims. Current law does not permit full and final settlement of claims. She maintained that there are situations when it would be entirely appropriate for workers to receive a lump sum upfront. She noted that 16 other states permit full and final settlement of claims in the workers' compensation area. Currently, carriers have to maintain a certain amount of reserve in order to cover an injured worker who may need additional treatment, whether or not a claim is re-opened, and that ties up capital for those carriers as well as for self-insured employers.

Mr. Smith commented that his concern is with those self-insured employers who currently cannot settle with a claimant.

Mr. Seel queried what the positive impact of this legislation will be on consumers. Ms. Briggs answered that for those injured workers where no additional care is required, it permits them to get a lump-sum settlement and have more control over their care.

Ms. McCune Davis asked whether injured workers are in a position to evaluate how much care they may need and what their medical needs will be in the future. Ms. Briggs said that is always a concern. She said that counsel to the claimant and a physician who has been treating the injured worker will be involved in the decision. She said she believes that more protections could be in the bill; however, the fundamental issue is whether people should be able to make their own decisions. Currently, there is no option; this legislation provides an option for consumers.

Mike Colletto, Executive Director, Community Horizons, spoke in opposition to HB2617. He stated that no one can anticipate future medical care. This proposal places the liability for medical care on the worker for the rest of his life. He maintained that in a state that provides lifetime benefit, it is wrong to ask injured workers who are under stress to make such a decision; he said it is a step backwards. This will have a major negative impact on individuals and he urged Members to vote against this legislation.

Ms. McCune Davis queried whether an injured worker who has other insurance will be able to get medical attention for that work-related injury through the other insurance. Mr. Colletto replied in the negative. He said that one cannot claim personal as well as workers' compensation insurance.

Mr. Williams questioned whether it is ever appropriate for an injured worker to negotiate directly for a lump-sum settlement. Mr. Colletto said he does not believe so. He reiterated that an injured worker has no way of knowing what will arise out of that injury. He said he believes that if people settle, subsequently run out of money, and then need medical care, they will have to depend on the Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System (AHCCCS) to pay for their medical bills.

Darryl Engle, Attorney, Association of Lawyers for Injured Workers, testified in opposition to HB2617. He advised that oftentimes, the potential for future surgery can occur and the costs are very substantial. These settlements will not be enough to pay for future medical treatment or compensation. The effect of this legislation is that it will shift the cost of private industrial claims onto the taxpayers. He stated that this legislation is detrimental to taxpayers, to the injured worker and to other employers. He asked Members to vote against this proposal.

Mr. Smith queried whether an attorney can advise an injured worker not to settle. Mr. Engle replied in the affirmative.

Terry Fox, representing self, opposed to HB2617, advised that he represents injured workers in workers' compensation claims. He stated that this is liability shifting of private costs to public taxpayers. Injured workers do not know what will happen in the future. In most cases, people go back to work and can re-injure themselves.

Mr. Smith asked whether injured workers can partially settle. Mr. Fox replied in the affirmative. Mr. Smith restated his concern for the self-insured employer who, under current law, is liable for the claim forever.

Ms. McCune Davis brought up language on page 9: "mutual mistake of a material fact," and asked how that would be proven. Mr. Fox responded that would require both the insurance company as well as the injured worker to have no idea as to what could possibly happen. He suggested that every insurance company with inside counsel has a good idea of the consequences of the injury to the worker.

Chairman McLain announced the names of those who signed up in opposition to HB2617 but did not speak:

Brian Clymer, Attorney, representing self
Janice Goldstein, Arizona Trial Lawyers Association
Rebekah Friend, Lobbyist, Arizona AFL-CIO

Chairman McLain announced the names of those who signed up in support of HB2617 but did not speak:

Farrell Quinlan, State Director, National Federation of Independent Business
Michelle Bolton, Vice President of Public Affairs, Greater Phoenix Chamber of Commerce
Lori Lustig, Tucson Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce
Kerry Hayden, Government Affairs Representative, Farmers Insurance Group of Companies
Jeff Gray, Legislative Liaison, Arizona Self-Insurers Association (ASIA)
J. Michael Low, Attorney, American Family
George Diaz, Senior Public Affairs Representative, Arizona Public Service
Lorna Romero, Director of Government Relations, Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry

Todd Madeksza, Director of Legislative Affairs, The County Supervisors Association
Heather Bernacki, Government Relations Associate, East Valley Chambers of Commerce Alliance

Chairman McLain announced the names of those who signed up as neutral on HB2617 but did not speak:

James Stabler, Chief Counsel, SCF Arizona

Chairman McLain commented that an injured employee should have the option to decide whether to make a full and complete settlement, relying on his best judgment, in consultation with his attorney and his physician. She reminded Members that these settlements have to be approved by the Industrial Commission, and said that is the safeguard built into this legislation,

Question was called on the motion that HB2617 do pass. The motion carried by a roll call vote of 5-1-0-1 (Attachment 9).

HB2666 - health insurance; exchange - DO PASS AMENDED

Vice-Chairman Dial moved that HB2666 do pass.

Brooke Olguin, Majority Research Analyst, reviewed the provisions of HB2666 which creates the Arizona Health Insurance Exchange as required by the federal Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA) (Attachment 10).

Vice-Chairman Dial moved that the McLain 22-line amendment dated 2/11/11 be adopted (Attachment 11).

Ms. Olguin explained that the McLain 22-line amendment dated 2/11/11 requires Senate confirmation of board appointees, clarifies the cost of joint comprehensive plans and requires that the second annual report include a recommendation on the maximum amount of assessments and user fees the Exchange should charge to support its operations (Attachment 11).

Chuck Bassett, Blue Cross Blue Shield of Arizona, in support of HB2666, advised that the intent of the bill is to create a new marketplace where individuals and small businesses can compare plans, purchase online, collect subsidies and tax credits available through the federal government and operate via a website. The National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC) developed a model act for states to use as they contemplate an Exchange. This legislation is based on that NAIC model. The options selected were based on flexibility, free market and minimal regulation. If the state does not act to create an Exchange by 2014, the federal government will. Blue Cross Blue Shield of Arizona believes it is better for the state to have oversight over the Exchange and for the marketplace to have a single regulator. If the federal government operates the Exchange, the state will be subject to dual regulation and possibly conflicting regulation in the same marketplace. The Exchange will begin operation in the summer of 2013. Open enrollment starts in the summer of 2013, while coverage begins in January 2014. In January 2013, the federal government will assess whether the state can begin operation that summer. For that reason, he maintained that the state needs to act now.

Mr. Williams queried whether Utah and Massachusetts both have Exchanges in place now. Mr. Bassett related that they are both in place. Utah's Exchange only deals with businesses and has to change to include individuals to comply with federal law. In reply to Mr. Seel, Mr. Bassett agreed that the Massachusetts Exchange is having a lot of problems with cost overruns.

Mr. Bassett related that this will be an important market. There are subsidies available under the federal law for families of four earning up to \$88,200. A large portion of the individual marketplace will be able to receive subsidized coverage. He asked that Members support this legislation because there will be an Exchange in this state by 2014, and if Arizona does not act, the Exchange will be run by the federal government. He pointed out that if Congress repeals the Act, there is a conditional repeal in this bill that stops the Exchange.

Mr. Bassett expressed concern about the language on the dental changes on lines 7 and 8 of the amendment because the stricken language comes from the federal law. He said he wants to ensure that the state can strike that language and that it does not prevent the offering of a package discount if somebody buys medical and dental coverage.

Chairman McLain mentioned that if this passes out of Committee, additional amendments will be offered. She said this is a work in progress. She said she understands that additional rules are expected from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

In response to Mr. Williams' query about the Exchange, Mr. Bassett explained that a website will be developed that will interface with three separate federal agencies. The Exchange will have to transmit subsidies, keep track of eligibility and payment of subsidies, as well as handle tax credits for eligible small employers. The Exchange will also need to check AHCCCS eligibility. Mr. Seel asked whether this will increase the number of enrollees on AHCCCS. Mr. Bassett replied that the Exchange has to check eligibility; it does not change AHCCCS standards.

Mr. Seel questioned whether there will be a penalty for not applying for health insurance and whether individuals will be prosecuted. Mr. Bassett said this is not a criminal issue, so there is no prosecution; however, there are fines associated with not buying insurance.

Brian Hummell, Director, Government Relations, American Cancer Society, Cancer Action Network, neutral on HB2666, recommended the following:

- A standard conflict of interest provision included to remove members from the board.
- More consumer representation on the board.
- Meeting information posted on the Internet.
- Only a single Exchange created.
- Insurance carriers required to operate within the Exchange.

Matt Jewett, Director of Health Policy, Children's Action Alliance, advised that the Alliance is neutral on HB2666, and commends the sponsor for this legislation for Arizona to develop its own Health Insurance Exchange. He stated that the Exchange is a smart way to make health insurance more affordable; it provides subsidies for low- and middle-income Arizonans to purchase health insurance. He said that a study estimates that about 750,000 new customers will

join the Exchange, allowing small businesses, individuals and families to have the same kind of bargaining power in health insurance that large companies have today. It also allows small business employees more choice in plans within the Exchange. He expressed concern that all but two of the board members represent the health insurance industry, which limits the voice of consumers. Additionally, the bill does not allow the governing board to have rule-making authority.

Nicholas Dranias, Director, Center for Constitutional Government, Goldwater Institute, representing self, spoke in opposition to HB2666. He said this is an opportunity to stand up against the implementation of an unconstitutional healthcare regime. Passage of this bill will undermine pending litigation in Florida, pending litigation brought by the Goldwater Institute and what the voters of Arizona passed last November in adopting the Healthcare Freedom Act amendment to the Arizona Constitution. He opined that the federal government is using the state as a tool to displace the state's own sovereign prerogatives. He urged Members to vote against this legislation.

Discussion ensued on pending litigation, constitutionality, and pre-emption of state law.

Mr. Seel again brought up the Exchange's database which will give the federal government a list of people who do not purchase health insurance which can subject them to prosecution. Mr. Dranias agreed that it will give the federal government a list of those individuals that they can penalize. He argued that this will indirectly compel Arizonans to participate in the federal healthcare plan.

Dr. Byron Schlomach, Economist, Goldwater Institute, representing self, testified in opposition to HB2666. He stated that from an economic standpoint, federal policy on healthcare is problematic because of third-party payers. He opined that the exchanges that are being set up create a very synthetic system and ultimately will not help solve the cost problem.

Mr. Seel asked whether implementing this policy will put an additional burden on the state. Mr. Schlomach concurred that it will be an extra cost to the state because the state will be obligated in the future to cover more people on Medicare.

Vice-Chairman Dial asked Dr. Schlomach to recommend improvements to the bill. Dr. Schlomach declined and said he does not believe that it is wise for the state to get involved with the federal government on healthcare. He said the wiser course of action is not to go to the federal government with a plan but to let the federal government come to the state for its choices. That way, the state, in a position of strength, can put conditions on the federal government.

Steve Barclay, Lobbyist, CIGNA HealthCare of Arizona, Inc., in support of HB2666, disagreed with Dr. Schlomach that the federal government will come to the state to ask the state's position on healthcare. He said the question is whether Arizona will design its own future or whether the federal government will do it for the state. He opined that with the Exchange, the state can design its own plan. This legislation gives time for the state to put something in place. He pointed out that this is a voluntary program. It creates a mechanism that runs parallel to the private-sector marketplace. It allows someone to stay in the private-sector marketplace.

Mr. Smith questioned whether passing this legislation will hurt the pending court cases. Mr. Barclay said it may affect the Goldwater lawsuit but he does not believe it will hurt pending litigation in other states.

Mr. Seel brought up the provision of the bill relating to the assessment of fees and costs by January 1, 2015. Chairman McLain asked whether the amendment deals with that. Mr. Barclay replied in the affirmative. He referred to language starting on line 12 of the amendment as well as the language on page 11 of the bill, line 35, which states that the assessments are to the carriers and are an administrative fee to make the Exchange self-sustaining and not be a burden on the state.

Mr. Seel assumed that since the assessment is a cost of doing business, it will be charged to the consumers. Mr. Barclay replied in the affirmative.

Chairman McLain announced the names of those who signed up in support of HB2666 but did not speak:

Lanny Hair, Executive Vice President, Independent Insurance Agents & Brokers of Arizona

Michelle Bolton, Vice President of Public Affairs, Greater Phoenix Chamber of Commerce

David Childers, Lobbyist, America's Health Insurance Plans

Wendy Briggs, Lobbyist, Arizona Association of Health Underwriters

Gregory Harris, Lobbyist, Delta Dental of Arizona

Jaime Molera, Lobbyist, Aetna Health Insurance

Jake Logan, United Healthcare of Arizona

Lorna Romero, Director of Government Relations, Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry

David Landrith, Vice President of Policy & Political Affairs, Arizona Medical Association

Michael Preston Green, Lobbyist, Health Net, Inc.

Jeff Sandquist, Arizona Association of Health Underwriters

Genevra Richardson, Director of Government Relations, United Healthcare of Arizona

Chairman McLain announced the names of those who signed up in opposition to HB2666 but did not speak:

PJ O'Malley, Americans For Prosperity

Joy Staveley, representing self

Steve Voeller, President, Arizona Free Enterprise Club

Tom Jenney, Director, Americans for Prosperity

Shawna Bolick, representing self

Roy Miller, Defender of Liberty, representing self

Chairman McLain announced the names of those who signed up as neutral on HB2666 but did not speak:

Karlene Wenz, Legislative Liaison, Department of Insurance

Question was called on the motion that the McLain 22-line amendment dated 2/11/11 be adopted (Attachment 11). The motion carried.

Vice-Chairman Dial moved that HB2666 as amended do pass. The motion carried by a roll call vote of 4-2-0-1 (Attachment 12).

Without objection, the meeting adjourned at 6:07 p.m.

Joanne Bell, Committee Secretary
February 21, 2011

(Original minutes, attachments and audio on file in the Chief Clerk's Office; video archives available at <http://www.azleg.gov>)