



MAINE ASSOCIATION  
OF  
HEALTH PLANS

September 30, 2020

Superintendent Cioppa  
Maine Bureau of Insurance  
34 State House Station  
Augusta, ME 04333-0034

Dear Eric,

I am writing to reiterate the real and significant concerns members of the Maine Association of Health Plans (MeAHP) have about the Clear Choice proposals and the combined disruption of merging the markets and moving to standardized plans simultaneously.

We want to offer helpful comments and it is our obligation and responsibility to be candid about the problems we see ahead with each proposal and especially should these market changes go forward all at once. Both premium and disruption considerations for all the options individually or combined must be examined and understood.

Health plans are responsible for offering products that people want and will purchase and they do not want consumers to be confused or priced out of the market. It is the Plans' informed view that the Clear Choice plans as proposed will increase premiums and force people into lower metal tiers of coverage and some out of coverage all together. Merging the markets will create another layer of uncertainty and an additional learning curve for all parties, resulting in more people falling out of coverage or purchasing lesser benefit plans.

We are concerned that the Bureau's analysis so far looks only at Individual plans, not Small Group. Small Group, including HSA compatible plans, needs a thorough analysis to understand the impact of the proposed changes, review people's coverage preferences and see where they are today. This is important because the mapping required to move people to Clear Choice products needs to be reasonable, not extreme. With just seven Clear Choice plans, the gap between metal levels could be broad and people may be required to move significantly either up or down.

To avoid this, the Plans request that the Bureau consider creating a "glide path" towards standardized plans rather than implementing them all at once. Ideally, one Clear Choice Plan could be tested at a time for consumer interest, feedback, and to trial the many

standardizations that the Bureau wishes to implement. It appears, based on statutory language, that only one standardized plan per metal tier is required by the legislation. We submit that the statute can also be interpreted to allow up to three alternative plans per metal tier, rather than total, to allow for up to four plans per metal tier to be submitted per year, one of which would be Clear Choice in Year 1. This would provide ample opportunity to review and adapt for unintended consequences of cost-sharing and copays, impacts on pharmacy, changes to actuarial value calculations, etc. with the least disruption to consumer choice and market stability. With more thorough review, Clear Choice Plans could slowly be expanded with real consumer experience and plan performance to learn from.

For health plans, individual and small group are two separate portfolios of products. Competitive health plans will have to be building different products appropriate for offering in a merged market, an individual market, and a small group market. If the individual and small group markets remain separate, each will have its own Clear Choice products. We believe the more measured approach suggested by MeAHP would simplify the changes and result in a smoother transition.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Katherine D. Pelletreau". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the typed name.

Katherine D. Pelletreau  
Cc: MeAHP Board of Directors