

Senate Fiscal Agency
P. O. Box 30036
Lansing, Michigan 48909-7536

SFA



BILL ANALYSIS

Telephone: (517) 373-5383
Fax: (517) 373-1986
TDD: (517) 373-0543

Senate Bill 151 (Substitute S-2 as reported)
Senate Bill 442 (Substitute S-1 as reported)
Sponsor: Senator Ken Sikkema
Committee: Health Policy

Date Completed: 3-23-99

RATIONALE

Under Public Act 35 of 1951, two or more municipal corporations, by intergovernmental contract, may form a group self-insurance pool to provide participating municipal corporations with risk management and coverage for pool members and employees. A municipal corporation may include any county, county road commission, township, village, school district, community college district, metropolitan district, court district, public authority, drainage district, or any local governmental authority or agency with the power to enter into contracts. Group self-insurance pools may include casualty insurance, property insurance, automobile insurance including motor vehicle liability, surety and fidelity insurance, and umbrella and excess insurance; however, the Act prohibits a group self-insurance pool from providing coverage for hospital, medical, surgical, or dental benefits to the employees of member municipalities (except in regard to automobile insurance coverage). This means, then, that local governmental units cannot provide health insurance for their employees through municipal self insurance pools.

At the same time, the Insurance Code allows business employers, under certain conditions, to provide health care benefits (and other benefits) through multiple employer welfare arrangements (MEWAs). Chapter 70 of the Code regulates MEWAs. An MEWA is prohibited from establishing an employee benefit plan unless it obtains a certificate of authority from the Insurance Commissioner (unless the plan is fully insured). Chapter 70 lists several conditions that an MEWA must meet to obtain a certificate, including a requirement that the employers in an MEWA be members of an association or group of five or more businesses that are in the same trade or industry, including closely related businesses that provide support, services, or supplies primarily to that trade or industry.

Some people believe that local governments and school districts (municipal corporations) should be allowed to pool their resources to attempt to reduce

the ever-increasing costs of health care, through the use of MEWAs. In addition, it has been suggested that the Insurance Code be amended to allow employers other than businesses to form an MEWA, and to make it easier for both business employers and other employers to qualify to form an MEWA.

CONTENT

Senate Bill 151 (S-2) would amend Public Act 35 of 1951 to permit two or more municipal corporations to form an MEWA under the Insurance Code, for hospital, medical, surgical, or dental benefits.

Senate Bill 442 (S-1) would amend the Insurance Code to reduce from five to two the number of employers needed to form an MEWA; allow two or more employer entities other than businesses to form an MEWA; and allow member employers to be in the same type of service, as well as in the same trade or industry.

MCL 124.5 (S.B. 151)
500.7011 & 550.7060 (S.B. 442)

ARGUMENTS

(Please note: The arguments contained in this analysis originate from sources outside the Senate Fiscal Agency. The Senate Fiscal Agency neither supports nor opposes legislation.)

Supporting Argument

Health insurance costs continue to rise, putting pressure on the limited resources of both public and private employers. While two or more local units of government or school districts are now allowed to form insurance pools for many purposes, such as casualty, property, and liability insurance, Public Act 35 of 1951 specifically prohibits these entities from contracting to form a pool for the provision of health insurance. At the same time, the Insurance Code allows businesses to form MEWAs; MEWAs have worked well for some employer groups, but the Code requires that an MEWA consist of at least five businesses in the same trade or industry, which restricts the ability of businesses to form MEWAs and

precludes formation by a public entity or service firm. By allowing local public entities to form MEWAs for the purpose of providing health insurance, and reducing the minimum number of employers that can join to form an MEWA, the bills would remove any conflicts between the Insurance Code and Public Act 35 and remove obstacles that now restrict both public and private entities from forming pools for health insurance. In turn, the bills would give these entities an opportunity to reduce the costs of health benefits by allowing employers to explore another option to traditional health insurance.

In addition, the Insurance Bureau reports that reducing the minimum number of participants to two would make the MEWA statute consistent with other Michigan laws that require only two members to form a group, such as a workers' compensation self-insured group or a trustee group for group disability insurance. Also, according to the Bureau, the Federal definition of an MEWA requires that only two employers participate to form the group.

Opposing Argument

According to the Insurance Bureau, a traditional insurer may have greater financial stability than a MEWA, because MEWAs are not required to maintain capital and surpluses to pay claims as are traditional insurers; further, MEWAs do not protect policyholders against insolvency because they do not participate in guaranty funds. Further, lowering from five to two the number of employers that may form an MEWA could reduce the stability of the MEWA.

Response: The Insurance Bureau also reports that the regulation of MEWAs is more comprehensive than the Bureau's regulation of intergovernmental insurance pools formed under other statutory provisions. In fact, the Bureau contends that the increased ability to regulate the operation of an MEWA gives employers and employees greater protection. Further, under the Insurance Code, an MEWA must cover at least 200 participating employees. Senate Bill 442 (S-2) would not change that requirement, meaning that despite the reduced number of participating employers, the size of the risk pool would remain unchanged.

Legislative Analyst: G. Towne

FISCAL IMPACT

Senate Bill 151 (S-2)

The bill would have no fiscal impact on State government. The bill could provide some administrative savings for local governments.

Senate Bill 442 (S-1)

The bill would have no fiscal impact on State or local government.

A9900s151a

This analysis was prepared by nonpartisan Senate staff for use by the Senate in its deliberations and does not constitute an official statement of legislative intent.