HOUSE COMMITTEE ON LABOR

March 25, 1997 Hearing Room E

8:30 A.M. Tapes 44 - 45

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rep. Steve Harper, Chair

Rep. Mike Fahey, Vice-Chair

Rep. Chris Beck

Rep. Dan Gardner

Rep. Bill Markham

Rep. John Minnis

MEMBER EXCUSED: Rep. Ron Sunseri

STAFF PRESENT:

Cara Filsinger, Administrator

Linda Spaulding, Administrative Support

MEASURE/ISSUES HEARD:

SB 116A Public Hearing and Work Session

SB 117A Public Hearing and Work Session

SB 118 Public Hearing

SB 119A Public Hearing

These minutes are in compliance with Senate and House Rules. <u>Only text enclosed in quotation marks reports a speaker's exact words.</u> For complete contents, please refer to the tapes.

| Tape/# | Speaker | Comments |
|---------------------|-----------------|--|
| TAPE 44, A | | |
| 005 | Chair Harper | Calls the meeting to order at 8:33 a.m. Opens public hearing on SB 116A. |
| SB 116A - PUBLIC | | |

| | | Administrator, Workers' Compensation Division (WCD), Department of Consumer and Business Services (DCBS) |
|-----|-----------------|--|
| 013 | Mary Neidig | Says Senate Bills 116 through 119 were drafted for governor's package and have been reviewed by Management Labor Advisory Committee (MLAC); explains all except SB 118 were amended in Senate. SB 118 has proposed amendments. |
| | | Interim Manager, Benefits Section |
| | | Explains provisions of SB 116A: |
| 028 | Mary Dora | * reduces disputes between insurers |
| | | * clarifies which parties may appeal closures of disputed claims |
| | | * ensures appropriate determinations of disability |
| 090 | Rep. Minnis | Asks intent of the bill. |
| 091 | Dora | Answers bill requires all responsibility or pro-rata issue claims be submitted to department for closure rather than insurers having ability t close. |
| 103 | Glen Lasken | Attorney, Sisters; Chairman, Workers' Compensation Section, Oregon State Bar (EXHIBIT B) |
| | | Provides perspective for Senate bills before committee. Says SB 116A addresses illusory problem; has potential for harm. Opposes SB 116A. |
| 143 | David Wilson | Attorney, Liberty Northwest Insurance Company; Chair-elect, Workers Compensation Section, Oregon State Bar |
| | | Opposes SB 116A. |
| 149 | Chair Harper | Asks clarification of statement that bill is unnecessary. |
| 151 | Lasken | Replies he has not seen evidence of serious harm; however, bill restricts rights of insurers to process claims. |
| 161 | _ | Asks if concerns are reduced by language in lines 19 and 20 that gives all parties the right to reconsideration and appeal. |
| 165 | Wilson | Answers insurers are doing good job closing claims with little appeal. Says appeals will continue whether or not statute is amended. |
| 175 | Rep. Fahey | Asks if there is advantage to speedy closures for all parties. |
| 180 | Wilson | Replies SB 116A does not change number of closures except in pro-rate claims. |
| 185 | | Comments additional litigation would result if Workers' Compensation Board or Court of Appeals shifts responsibility for claim closure to |

| | | another employer with ensuing dispute. |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 201 | Rep. Markham | Asks if bill was introduced by MLAC. |
| 203 | Chair Harper | Answers bill brought by DCBS. |
| 210 | Chris Davie | SAIF Corporation; says SAIF has no problems with SB 116A. |
| 219 | Chair Harper | Closes public hearing on SB 116A. Opens work session on SB 116A. |
| SB 116A - WORK SESSION | | |
| 223 | Rep. Minnis | MOTION: Moves SB 116A to the floor with a DO PASS recommendation. |
| | | VOTE: 5-0 AYE: In a roll call vote, all members present vote Aye. EXCUSED: 2 - Gardner, Sunseri |
| | Chair Harper | The motion CARRIES. REP. HARPER will lead discussion on the floor. |
| 240 | Chair Harper | Closes work session on SB 116A. Opens public hearing on SB 117A. |
| SB 117A - PUBLIC HEARING | | |
| 244 | Rep. Fahey | MOTION: Requests unanimous consent that the rules be SUSPENDED to allow REP. GARDNER to be RECORDED as voting AYE on SB 116A. |
| 248 | Chair Harper | VOTE: Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED. |
| 253 | Mary Neidig | States SB 117A is sponsored by WCD, amendments proposed by MLAC. |
| 259 | Greg Malkasian | Manager, Compliance Section, WCD (EXHIBIT C) Explains importance of SB 117-A. States intent is to assure that names of complainants and alleged violators are held confidential in the course of investigations conducted by WCD. |
| 306 | Malkasian | Discusses three specific issues: * name of complainant always be held confidential |

| | | * party being investigated be apprised of nature of investigation |
|--------------------------|-----------------|---|
| | | * parties to investigation be fully informed of findings and reasons for findings |
| 327 | Malkasian | Says clarifying amendments provide confidentiality when conducting investigations; language consistent with Insurance Division and OR-OSHA. |
| 333 | Rep. Markham | Requests repeat of last sentence. |
| 334 | Malkasian | Repeats bill language is consistent with confidentiality provisions currently in statute for Insurance Division and OR-OSHA. |
| | | Opposes SB 117-A. Expresses two-fold concern: (EXHIBIT D) |
| | | * bill address problem that is illusory |
| 351 | Lasken | * non-discoverability of investigation materials |
| | | Questions need for the bill; rules that govern claimants are in statute provisions. |
| 407 | Wilson | Agrees; expresses concern there is no discovery of material. |
| 433 | Malkasian | Says language amends public records law. Reiterates concern is for confidentiality of name of complainant. |
| TAPE 45, <i>A</i> | Λ | |
| 042 | Malkasian | Says if action is taken by division following investigation, information is available through discovery for purpose of defending alleged violator. |
| 047 | Chair Harper | Asks for clarification on "neither the complaints nor the investigatory material would be subject to disclosure." |
| 049 | Malkasian | Clarifies if penalty action is taken and party requests a hearing, information is available under discovery. |
| 063 | Lasken | Says language could be drafted to ensure disclosure. |
| 077 | Rep. Markham | Asks if language change would destroy intent of bill. |
| 079 | Lasken | Answers affirmatively. Says current language requires party to enter litigation and have a hearing in order to access material. |
| 096 | Malkasian | Refers to language pg. 3, line 24 which keeps confidential identity of person making complaint with regard to workers' compensation. |
| 117 | Chair Harper | Confirms intent of bill is to protect confidentiality of complainant. |
| 118 | Neidig | Answers affirmatively; intent is to allow name of original complainant or person against whom complaint is made to be released at any point during investigation. Says MLAC amendments protect confidentiality during investigation; language mirrors rules of OR-OSHA. |
| | | Oregon State Industrial Union Council, Chair, Committee Safety, |

| 141 | Diane | Health, and Workers' Compensation (AFL-CIO). |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|---|
| 141 | Rosenbaum | Supports SB 117A. |
| 173 | Lasken | States he would support SB 117A if amended to withhold names of complainant and person in noncompliance. |
| 192 | Chair Harper | Asks clarification that director will establish procedures for keeping identify of parties confidential. |
| 195 | Lasken | Says problem is confidentiality of investigation material. |
| 205 | Rep. Fahey | Asks if he has a problem with rules of OR-OSHA. |
| 207 | Lasken | Replies he only considers legislation as it affects workers' compensation clients. |
| 222 | Rep. Beck | Asks if cases of complainant's name withheld, but nature of complaint was made public; complainant's name would be public knowledge. |
| 229 | Lasken | Replies complainant's identity would be hidden in small company; issue is one of noncompliance on part of employer. |
| 236 | Rep. Beck | Expresses concern that employee's identity in small company would be difficult to conceal. |
| 248 | Lasken | Says employees who talk among themselves leave themselves open to discovery. |
| 259 | Rep. Beck | Asks for clarification of process from filing, ruling, and hearing. |
| 269 | Lasken | Replies SB 117A provides for discretion of director to allow information to be made public. |
| 274 | Malkasian | Says attempts are made under current procedures maintaining confidentiality of complainant. Describes process division follows for conducting investigations. |
| 290 | Rep. Beck | Confirms when employer is dissatisfied with conclusion a hearing follows. |
| 293 | Malkasian | Agrees a hearing could result from the process. |
| 309 | Chair Harper | Closes public hearing on SB 117A. Opens work session on SB 117A. |
| SB 117 - WORK SESSION | | |
| 313 | Rep. Fahey | MOTION: Moves SB 117A to the floor with a DO PASS recommendation. |
| | | VOTE: 5-0 |
| | | AYE: In a roll call vote, all members present vote Aye. |
| | | EXCUSED: 2 - Minnis, Sunseri |
| | | The motion CARRIES. |

| | Chair Harper | REP. BECK will lead discussion on the floor. |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|---|
| 324 | Chair Harper | Closes work session on SB 117A. Opens public hearing on SB 118. |
| SB 118 - PUBLIC HEARING | | |
| 336 | Mary Neidig | Administrator, WCD explains SB 118 passed out of Senate without amendments. |
| 348 | Mari Miller | Manager, Dispute Resolution, WCD (EXHIBIT E) Address key points of written testimony (EXHIBIT E, p. 3). Explains intent for cost avoidance. Lists how SB 118 (with amendments) supports Oregon Benchmark goals: * improves government efficiency * eliminates waste |
| 397 | Miller | * reduces litigation States SB 118 protects administrative rule; clarifies in statute there can be only one reconsideration which gives both parties opportunity to make their cases. |
| 404 | Miller | Clarifies claim closures have never involved multiple reconsiderations. Describes how multiple reconsiderations create confusion. |
| TAPE 44, B | | |
| 032 | Miller | Describes scenario of injured worker with permanent disability; explains process of 60-day appeal period to file reconsideration. Says -1 amendment assures that worker may take full time line or sooner. Says amended version is approved by MLAC; asks committee to pass bill. |
| 082 | Lasken | Says amendments pose significant change; asks to provide written analysis following consult with Oregon Bar Workers' Compensation Section (EXHIBIT F). |
| 102 | Linda Love | Oregon Workers Trial Lawyers Explains significance of changes in law prohibiting worker from submitting evidence at hearing following reconsideration order from insurer. Says amendments lengthen time period worker can participate for full 60 days. Questions amendments with respect to express waiver; opposes waiver deemed to have occurred with passage of time but only if party expressly waives. |
| 149 | Miller | Says waiver during administrative proceedings requires that it be a written informed consent. |
| | <u> </u> | |

| 168 | Rep. Markham | Asks Ms. Love if she is concerned with testimony with respect to administrative rule. |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|---|
| 170 | Love | Says she is less nervous since Ms. Miller's testimony; prefers to see "written" in front of "waived" in the bill. |
| 176 | Chair Harper | Closes public hearing SB 118. Opens public hearing SB 119-A. |
| SB 119-A - PUBLIC HEARING | | |
| 189 | Mary Neidig | Administrator, WCD, explains SB 119A was originally proposed by WCD. |
| 197 | Mari Miller | Manager, Dispute Resolution, WCD (EXHIBIT G) Presents talking points (EXHIBIT G, pp. 3, 4). |
| 312 | Rep. Minnis | Expresses concern that medical arbiters receive most of their income from these examinations. |
| 325 | Miller | Replies SB 119 does not specifically deal with qualifications of medical arbiters; WCD's recruitment comes from attending physician pools. Says division investigates complaints brought against physician. |
| 384 | Rep. Minnis | Refers to article in Willamette Week with respect to competency relevant to physicians as medical arbiters. |
| 393 | Miller | Explains department randomly selects physicians depending on exam location. WCD has quality assurance program with arbiter process. |
| TAPE 45, B | | |
| 011 | Rep. Minnis | Asks if opinion of medical arbiter is binding. |
| 012 | Miller | Answers opinion is not binding; medical arbiter used to resolve disputes over medical findings. |
| 023 | Rep. Minnis | Asks if medical arbiter consults with original physician. |
| 024 | Miller | Replies no; they receive complete medical records to use in examination. |
| 031 | Rep. Fahey | Asks how division views insurance doctors who may be more conservative in findings than original physician. |
| 042 | Miller | Explains rating of the attending physician of permanent disability is used to initially close claim. |
| 071 | Rep. Minnis | Asks need for bill if 95 percent of cases injured party requests arbiter. |
| 079 | Miller | Clarifies 95 percent of requests for reconsideration are injured workers; says high number of injured workers request exams by medical arbiters. The number who fail to go to arbiter exam is about ten percent. Bill addresses workers who do not cooperate and risk suspension of benefits. |
| | | |

| 104 | Rep. Minnis | Asks why process not done by administrative rule. |
|-----|-----------------|---|
| 105 | Miller | Explains statute stipulates reconsideration order in 18 working days and within 60 days for medical arbiter. Statute requiring suspension of benefits for failure of injured worker to cooperate did not provide for additional time to allow for rescheduling of examinations. |
| 117 | Rep. Gardner | Asks who determines the need for medical arbiter. |
| 126 | Miller | Answers director shall order medical arbiter exam if either party or WCD determines problem with impairment findings used to close the claim. |
| 134 | Rep. Gardner | Asks if medical arbiter used in contested cases. |
| 136 | Miller | Replies no; impairment used to close claim is not always basis for reconsideration. |
| 141 | Rep. Gardner | Asks how often division does not go with medical arbiter's decision. |
| 143 | Miller | Answers she does not have that information; arbiter's report may not be used exclusively. |
| 150 | Rep. Gardner | Asks for confirmation that high percentage uses medical arbiter's decision. |
| 151 | Miller | Presumes a figure of over 50 percent. |
| | | SAIF Corporation |
| 158 | Chris Davie | Supports concepts in SB 119A; offers proposed amendment (EXHIBIT H) that provides clarifying language. |
| 184 | Miller | States WCD has no objection with amendment language proposed by SAIF. |
| 223 | Lasken | Supports concept of allowing department additional time to reschedule medical examinations and complete reconsideration. Submits proposed amendments that address concerns (EXHIBIT I). |
| 254 | Miller | Says current statute and bill provide that benefits cannot be suspended unless good cause. Suggests presenting amendments to MLAC. |
| 319 | Chair Harper | Advises Mr. Lasken to return with official amendment drawn by Legislative Counsel. |
| 327 | Rep. Beck | Asks clarification on reconsideration process. |
| 336 | Miller | Answers reconsideration process is administrative review process, not hearing process. Explains process. |
| 352 | Rep. Beck | Asks if insurer requests new medical arbiter. |
| 359 | Miller | Replies no, this is misconception. Insurer may request medical arbiter because of vested interest when injured worker calls for reconsideration. |
| 375 | Chair | Requests pictorial presentation of arbitration process to aid committee's |

| | Harper | understanding. |
|-----|-----------------|---|
| 379 | Rep. Minnis | Asks if WCD has statistics on number of physicians who earn more than 50 percent of income as medical arbiters. |
| 385 | Miller | Answers no. |
| 389 | Rep. Fahey | MOTION: Requests unanimous consent that the rules be SUSPENDED to allow Rep. Minnis to vote NO on SB 117A. |
| | Chair Harper | Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED. |
| | | |
| 396 | Chair Harper | Closes public hearing on SB 119A. Adjourns the meeting at 10:18 a.m. |

Submitted By, Reviewed By,

Linda Spaulding, Cara Filsinger,

Administrative Support Administrator

EXHIBIT SUMMARY

- A SB 116A, written testimony, Mary Dora, 4 pp
- B SB 116A, written testimony, Glen Lasken, 1 p
- C SB 117A, written testimony, Greg Malkasian, 5 pp
- D SB 117A, written testimony, Glen Lasken, 1 p
- E SB 118, written testimony, Mari Miller, 3 pp
- F SB 118, written testimony, Glen Lasken, 1 p
- G SB 119A, written testimony, Mari Miller, 4 pp
- H SB 119A, written testimony, Chris Davie, 1 p
- I SB 119A, written testimony, Glen Lasken, 1 p