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MS. DENISH: I'm going to call the meeting to order.

I'd like someone to call the roll.

Melissa, can someone call the roll? So who is on, because we have some phone numbers on here and I'd like to know of any of our other Board members who aren't on video.

MS. GUTIERREZ: Committee Chair Diane Denish.

MS. DENISH: Present.

MS. GUTIERREZ: Jennifer Ford.

MS. FORD: Present.

THE COURT: Mr. David Hunton.

MR. HUNTON: Present.

MS. GUTIERREZ: Mr. Scott Yursic.

MR. YURSIC: Good morning, present.

MS. GUTIERREZ: Mr. Benny Hodges. I saw Benny, I'm sure --

MR. HODGES: Present.

MS. GUTIERREZ: Ms. Patti Green Williams.

MS. WILLIAMS: Here.

MS. GUTIERREZ: Ms. Alegra Carpenter.

MS. CARPENTER: Present.
MS. GUTIERREZ: Mr. Douglas R. Perkins.

MR. PERKINS: Present.

MS. GUTIERREZ: Mr. Goeffrey Romero.

MR. ROMERO: Present.

MS. GUTIERREZ: That is everyone.

MS. DENISH: Okay. Thank you.

Let me just say thank you to everybody, and I think the superintendent and I actually had a socially distanced cup of coffee about a month or so ago, and we agreed that he was very eager to have this meeting, so I appreciate everybody getting on to kind of get the rundown of what we're going to -- what's been happening and what he's looking forward to.

So, unless anybody else has any introductory remarks, I will go ahead and take a motion for approval of agenda. Are there any?

MR. HODGES: I would so move, Madam Chairman.

MS. DENISH: Do I hear a second.

MS. CARPENTER: Second.

MS. DENISH: All in favor.

(All parties said, "Aye.")

MS. DENISH: Opposed?

(No response.)
MS. DENISH: The approval of our minutes, which seems like an eternity ago, January 17th, I've read through them, I didn't see anything that jumped out at me. Are there any additions, corrections that people have noticed from our January 17 meeting? And, if not, I would take a motion to approve the minutes.

MR. PERKINS: Madam Chairwoman, let me back up just a little bit.

In the prior meeting, Ms. DeMeule had explained or recommended that we need an adoption of the Open Meetings Act Resolution, and she had required -- she had made a recommendation that we go through that approval process at each committee meeting. Do we need to -- is Ms. DeMeule on the call today?

MS. DENISH: I'm sorry, Randy, what are you saying, that we have to do that at every meeting?

MR. PERKINS: She had made a comment explaining that the statute requires that it be adopted in January for every committee meeting during the year, and it was the adoption of the Open Meetings Act Resolution.

MS. DENISH: So she's on here somewhere,
but maybe she's on mute. I saw her.

MR. PERKINS: Is she on? Okay.

MS. DENISH: She's somewhere. There she is, she's talking, you're on mute; we can't hear you. She on mute, maybe I can unmute her.

We can't hear you. It shows she's on mute. Can you unmute, Myra? There you go --

MR. PERKINS: There you go -- no.

MR. ROMERO: I think she's indicating she can type on the chat line.

MS. DENISH: I don't see her in the chat, but my thing shows she's on mute. There we go, she's on the chat box now. Maybe, Melissa can you -- Maybe Melissa, unmute her?

MS. GUTIERREZ: I tried, and I don't show her as muted, her little microphone is clear to go, Diane, because I tried to click on her mute button and I couldn't get her. She may want to go out and come back in.

MS. DENISH: She did say once we've adopted our open meetings resolution, it's valid for the year.

MR. PERKINS: Okay. Perfect.

MS. DENISH: So, back to the minutes, and adoption of the minutes from that meeting.
1 Did we adopt -- we did adopt the meetings
2 resolution in that meeting, right?
3                              
4 MR. PERKINS: We did.
5                              
6 MS. DENISH: Is there a motion to
7 approve the minutes as written?
8                              
9 MR. HODGES: I believe I so moved, Madam
10 Chairman.
11                              
12 MS. DENISH: All in favor, say "Aye".
13                              
14 (Note: All members said, "Aye.")  
15                              
16 MS. DENISH: Okay. Thank you. Now
17 we're going go to the superintendent's update,
18 which is the core of this meeting, and so we'll
19 turn it over to you, Russell. If you have barking
20 dogs or anything, put yourself on mute, or if you
21 want to bark, put yourself on mute. And then, at
22 the end we'll have a chance for questions, just
23 either put your question in the chat room, or wave
24 your hand and we'll -- and unmute yourself, okay?
25                              
26 SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: Thank you, and
27 thanks to all the members. We're here, I'm
28 delighted to see this great attendance. I've had
29 the pleasure of talking to a number of you since
30 our January meeting, and I also hope that you
31 found that report that we sent out to you whenever
32 that was, I guess June, helpful, I apologize for
the length of it, but we were trying to make sure
that you knew all that was going on.

I wish that you-all had told me in
November of last year that we were going to be
dealing with COVID. It certainly has impacted
everybody on this call and everybody in the state,
of course. We really had a crash run, if you
will, when the Governor decided to take aggressive
action, and I'm actually quite pleased at the way
the agency responded, and I'll talk about that a
little more detail.

I am in the office every day. The
office, those of you who have been to the OSI,
know that the superintendent's office is sort of
quarantined off to the side. I'm here because we
have five or six people who really have to be here
every day to handle the huge volume of mail that
we get. And I'll have to admit that I mistakenly
assumed that the insurance world, for the most
part, was all electronic and, while a large part
of it is, there is sure a ton of it that is still
done hard copy.

So we have filings that come in by mail,
we have lots of checks, believe it or not, that
come in with mail. We're going to try to fix
that, and we get lots inquiries. And the other
thing that we have to do on a daily basis is,
we -- as the attorneys on this call know, we serve
essentially as the server of process, so if
somebody's filing an action against an insurance
company, it comes to us and we actually take care
of the service, and that doesn't let up, either.

So, as long as the other staff have to
be here, then I feel like I should be here, and it
probably won't surprise any of you to learn that
my wife is very happy about that arrangement, so I
find myself here being much more productive than I
would be at home.

The 2020 regular session, I think went
very well. The 2020 special session was really
bizarre. It was, as you all know, virtual, no one
was allowed inside the Roundhouse, thankfully,
both the Governor's office and Legislative Finance
Committee left us off the budget reduction list
since we do not get any general funds from the
appropriations process. We are funded, as you all
know, exclusively through the fees that we
collect, but it still was bizarre to have to try
to track everything through this same medium that
we're using here today.
There were several pieces of legislation from the regular session, Melissa, if you'll hit -- there you go -- that impacted us.

(Note: Screen sharing.)

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: We sent a notice out on the first one, to all insurance carriers saying they had to take this action. We've met with the New Mexico Health Insurance Exchange several times, in fact, I'm a member of that Board and I'd be happy to talk about that in more detail, if there are questions about the changes that we're pushing at the Exchange. They have to send us a new plan of operation in September for us to review and approve. The goal is for the New Mexico Health Insurance Exchange to become a state-based exchange instead of an operation that uses the federal platform.

Now, it's not just a platform question, however, the attractiveness of being a state-based exchange, is we can set our own open enrollment period, which we could not do in the middle of this COVID pandemic like the other state-based exchanges did. We can set our own requirements for what are called standard plan design, and it allows us to be far more responsive to the
specific market demands that we can, having to follow all the CMS rules.

So, we are still working on that. I want to go ahead and let you know that we had a dramatic increase in the number of insurance plans that are proposed to be offered during open enrollment this fall, so much so, that we had to bring in a second actuarial firm to assist with the reviews.

Because we're an exchange that uses the federal guidelines, one of the frustrations that we have is that the Federal Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services continues to raise the out-of-pocket maximums and, from my perspective, they've really gotten unreasonable. For example, for this upcoming open enrollment period, the maximum out-of-pocket for individuals, according to CMS, can be as high as 8,500, or 17,100 for a family.

Now, I think I can gather most of the people who can afford that in my office. I mean, it's just simply unaffordable for most New Mexicans. So as we're completing our review process, one of the things we're asking all the carriers to do, is to maximize the actuarial value
of their plans by lowering the maximum 
out-of-pocket, but if we have a carrier that says, 
"No, I'm going with the CMA's guidelines," 
unfortunately, there's not very much we can do 
that will change next year, but this year we're 
sort of stuck, but anyway, we're moving forward on 
that.

The 126 covers for health artery calcium 
scan, that takes effect in January, we've made 
sure all the health plans is that are being 
submitted for review to extend that coverage. The 
specific criteria for who can be covered, it's not 
just open to anybody who thinks they want a scan, 
so we're trying to check for that.

234 which directly impacts you, allows 
the Chair of the committee to appoint a 
superintendent and removes the requirement that 
the superintendent be a resident, and we were 
faced with the situation where if, for example, I, 
God forbid, had some health problem that would 
prevent me from doing my duties, once we gave 
notice, there was no provision in the statute for 
your committee to have an interim superintendent 
until you go through the formally designed process 
outlined in the statute for selection of a new
superintendent.

So we thought this was -- and the Governor thought this was something we needed to do, so that did get signed into law, thankfully. No action is required of you at this point, and I certainly hope that will continue to be the case.

The prescription drug cost sharing, this you may recall was the subject of some debate. The CAPS consumer cost sharing for insulin products in the Bill, also ordered a study group to look at nine other drug categories to determine whether the cost sharing associated with those categories was precluding people from getting their prescriptions, so we brought in an actuarial firm, a different one, and they have done a data call to all the carriers, we'll be getting that information in the next week or two, certainly before the end of August, and then we have to do some analysis about what is the impact of the co-pays and can we or should we recommend to the Legislature that they take similar action?

One of the things that we obviously have to be sensitive to, is that we not do some significant cost shifting. So, if we require or we impose limits on cost sharing, we want to make
sure that the premiums don't bounce up dramatically on the other end, so that's part of the reason for getting an actuarial firm who can help us do those estimates.

And then, finally, Senate Bill 1, which has to do with the importation of prescription drugs from Canada, we did create an advisory committee, we're doing a data call on this, we then take that information, and we compare it to the pricing information that we access from Canada, and we have a public hearing on that, and the bill calls for us to have a plan to go to the FDA, I think by December 15th, if I remember the exact date.

Now, while this is going on, the Trump Administration has said that it's going to issue final -- it's going to issue final rules for the State on drug importation, so we may have to start and stop and start and stop until those rules are made public to us, but our report obviously will be the subject of some degree of interest.

There's about five states who have submitted proposals, our nearest neighbor would be Colorado that has a plan. Colorado submitted a plan to import approximately 1,600 different
drugs, most of the other states are being far more selective.

The big challenge for any state who wants to do this, is they really have to get a wholesaler to manage the process. It is not something a state can or, from my perspective, should try to do, but it remains to be seen whether we have wholesalers who are receiving a lot of pressure from the pharmaceutical industry, itself, not to support these efforts, whether we can get a wholesaler who wants to be part of this process.

We are probably going to do a request for information to see if we get any interest from the respective wholesalers that have the capacity. There are lots of different small wholesalers, frankly, they could not handle something of this size, so we're looking at the five or six largest, all of which have a presence in New Mexico, thankfully, but we don't know the level of interest, yet.

So, those were the major bills that came out of the regular session that were -- that we're having to deal with. There were no bills in the special session that had an impact on us, except
for the Bill that requires licensed or certified police officers to have body cameras. And, as I think most of you know, we have a Criminal Fraud Unit and we have six agents there that in fact are certified as police, and so we are in the process of buying a body camera for those individuals, and perhaps once we demonstrate how well they work, we can show them to the sheriff from Bernalillo County, and he may change his mind. But, that was the only thing that really came out of the special session, as I mentioned. We had no budget impact to us.

Let me stop there, and see if you have questions about any of these Bills.

MR. HODGES: Madam Chariman,

Mr. Superintendent.

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: Yes, sir.

MR. HODGES: On the House Bill 234, maybe I was a little distracted, it suggests that the -- and I don't recall reading it -- the summary suggests that allows the Chair of the Insurance Nominating Committee to appoint that in conjunction with the Nominating Committee, or was that the Chair's sole and separate project?

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: The vision was
that it be done in cooperation, but it
specifically gives the Chair the authority to make
the interim appointment.

MR. HODGES: So it would really be up to
the Chair to determine how she wants to accomplish
that or -- in this case.

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: Yeah, I think the
point is, it couldn't be a long-term appointment,
because once the committee knows there's going to
be a vacancy, that it needs to start the normal
application process.

MR. HODGES: You can't have a five-year
interim?

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: No, you cannot.

MR. HODGES: Roger that.

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: Any other
questions about legislation?

Okay.

So, COVID-19. Within two days of the
Governor's emergency declaration in March, we had
90 plus percent of our staff working from home.
We had already, prior to the order, formed a COVID
working group in-house, and we went about the
process of making sure that people had the laptops
and other equipment and VPM access, and all that
sort of thing to be able to do their job. We also
decided who it is that needs to come into the
office on a rotating basis to handle the mail, as
I talked about earlier.

But then the immediate issue became,
what can we do to respond to this pandemic in an
appropriate way? And I must say that, personally,
I think we went about it the right way. Instead
of just issuing edicts, we had conference calls
with the health insurance community, virtual
meetings, we sent out drafts of bulletins for them
to look at, we also chose to follow the guidance
that came out from the American Association of
Health Insurance Plans, which was quite helpful to
us.

The initial step bulletin that we
issued, dealt with both what the insurance had to
report and what they had to do and, as I think you
probably all know, the most important thing we
did, and we were among the very first one or two
states in the country, we said, "If you have a
COVID test or you need COVID treatment, that the
insurer and the provider cannot charge you. The
insurance company can be charged, of course, but
there can be no cost sharing obligations imposed
on the citizen." And that included any kind of related charges, not just the collection of the specimen for the test, but the office visit charge and things like that.

And that I think it was important for us to make a very clear statement about where that line was. There was some occasions where we had to intervene with specific providers coming from Medicaid and the HSD world and many of these providers I knew and, frankly, being able to just make a phone call and say, "You can't do what you're doing"; or, "You have to change your policy"; or, "You need to refund the payments that these individuals made" has been very helpful.

And, we only, on occasion, do we find people running afoul of that. I had to make a call earlier this week to a hospital CEO, whose emergency room had gone rogue and was charging people for COVID testing inappropriately, but for the most part, there's been really great compliance and cooperation from the respective provider associations.

Now, New Mexico is very fortunate that the Legislature had the foresight to put into the statute, coverage for telemedicine and telehealth,
and it says in the statute that the payment for telemedicine or telehealth, which must be required -- which must be covered by insurers, that the payments have to be equal to what they would pay for an in-office visit and the statute also prohibits any kind of discrimination for provision of mental or behavioral health services.

So, again, we jumped out there very early and said, "Here's what the statutes say, this is how we're interpreting it and enforcing this," and I think it really has been a lifesaver for many providers who lost 80 or 90 percent of their business overnight, people quit coming when they were told to stay at home and they did. Hospitals canceled elective procedures, as you all know, but because of the use of telehealth and telemedicine, the providers were able to continue to operate and generate the revenue they need and, most importantly, access their patients.

We made it clear to the insurance community that they could not impose unreasonable requirements, so no prior approval for telehealth visits or telemedicine visits, no imposition of point of origin requirements because, frankly, a lot of the physicians were like the rest of us,
operating from home, so I think that has been the
title reason, part of the reason that many people
have been -- many providers have been able to hold
on, but --

MR. HODGES: Mr. Chairman can I ask a
question there -- I mean, Mr. Superintendent.

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: Of course.

MR. HODGES: Would that apply also to
out-of-state health providers.

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: Yes, it does. If
they're in the insurance carrier's network.

MR. HODGES: Right, yes they are.

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: Then it does
apply.

MR. HODGES: I've got a specific issue
in my own case, but I'll figure that out with my
insurance company. Thank you.

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: But we have a lot
of citizens who use Lubbock and El Paso on
occasion, so it's important to have access to
those services.

Now, I will tell you this, we got
requests I probably shouldn't characterize it this
way, but we got requests supplied by providers who
want licenses in New Mexico and wanted the
coverage of the patient compensation fund during this period and we said no to those. Nobody pushed back. We asked insurers, not just health insurers, but all insurers, refrain from canceling or not renewing policies. We, with the Governor's assistance, clarified the insurance that insurance was in fact an essential business, and if they needed to have people in the office to service customers and clients, then that was okay.

We asked the insurance carriers to provide direct and advance support for hospitals and providers and make payments more expeditiously and, very importantly, we issued the bulletin on surprise billing saying that with respect to COVID matters there was no distinction between in-network and out-of-network, that whenever someone went to get a test or treatment, that had to be considered in-network, and, for other types of services during the period of the emergency, we reminded them of the provisions of the New Mexico statute, in terms of how they were to pay.

In 11, we asked the commercial insurers that base their insurance on sales volume, number of employees, operating days or hours, to make adjustments to reflect the shutdowns or the
reduced operations that were occurring across the
state. And I think you also know that we made the
similar request to the auto insurance commute and
I hope you all saw the presence release that we,
through our actions, we have about $67 million
that's being returned to New Mexico auto
policyholders.

And then, last week, we issued a new
COVID bulletin, again, we did so after discussing
it at length with the insurance community before
they released. It took quite a while to bulletin
out because of the coordination that was required
with the Department of Health, the Governor's
Office and Human Services Department and, because
of the continually-changing landscape out of
Washington.

Now, I'm not talking about politics, in
our case I'm talking about the fact that the
Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services keeps
issuing new interpretations of what they'll cover
and what they won't cover, and it has been a
scramble, quite frankly, to keep up and there are
some things that we just don't agree with CMS,
and, thankfully, the legislation that has been
passed by Congress, allows the states to impose
higher consumer protection provisions if the State authorizes that. And I'll give you one example of COVID. The feds say that the insurer has to cover costs associated with the test, if possible, an actual test is ordered.

Our position is, that if somebody comes in and they believe they need a test, then that health provider has to perform some kind of medical service, an assessment, to determine whether a test is appropriate or not, that those costs, too, should be covered, because we don't want to discourage people who think they need that test, from getting the care that they need.

The other important distinction, the CMS took the position that no surveillance testing of any kind could be covered. And, again, we're saying differently that if people are in a high-risk environment, a long-term care facility, a childcare facility or, frankly, they're a member of the Navajo Nation, for example that, those people should be tested, even if they're presenting without symptoms.

So those are the kind of things we tried to address in our latest bulletin, if you're wondering why it was five pages long, the answer
is, it was the elephant created by committee, and
I would have preferred it be shorter, but there
were lots of things we had to address.

I don't intend to read through all the
press releases that are shown there for you, but
hopefully you're getting a copy of all those, I
believe Melissa is sending everything to you, and
we will continue to do that. We actually released
another statement just yesterday, some of you may
be aware, that the health insurance carrier, New
Mexico Health Connections, is closing down at the
end of the year. We released a statement about
that saying, "Well, if you have coverage through a
plan, your coverage is good through the year, and
your insurance claims, your service claims will be
honored, even past the end of the year."

MS. DENISH: Mr. Superintendent, this is
Diane, how many lives does that affect? How many
subscribers did they have.

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: At present, Madam
Chair, they have about 14,000.

MS. DENISH: And their they're risk
based -- were you going to have to close them down
if they didn't do it voluntarily? Were you going
to have to take over?
SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: Well, essentially we've been in that position.

MS. DENISH: You've been running it, right.

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: It's a receivership arrangement, so all the releases, for example that the New Mexico Health Connections issued on Monday, those were all drafted and edited and approved by our office.

For those of you who don't know, a company out of Colorado called Friday Health, has stepped in and is basically underwriting their operation, and they have submitted plan proposals to take over that business to the fullest extent that they can.

Are there any questions about the bulletins or about any of the press releases? I'm happy to take any questions. These are just the bulletins related to COVID-19, of course.

MS. DENISH: I don't know about the rest. I just want to say I got an auto insurance refund, which I thought was one of those grand things -- the only good thing I can remember, just because companies are issuing those premium refunds for less driving, less accidents,
whatever. Anyway those are kind of nice little surprises that came out. I don't know if that's what your April 10th press release was about premium refunds, but certainly ...

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: Yes, that's been helpful, and we've gotten word that some of the businesses have gotten adjustments on their insurance, as well.

Okay.

MS. DENISH: Are there any other questions on this portion?

Okay.

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: Okay --

MS. DENISH: Yeah, go ahead.

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: Well, again, I don't think it's probably a good use of the committee's time for me to go over all these rules, we just wanted to give you the orders, we wanted to give you a sense of the things that we have done to ensure that, with respect to COVID, that we've done everything we can do because what's not reflected in this, I want committee to know that there have been lots of individual cases that we've gotten involved in, people who can't pay premiums, people who suffered business
catastrophes, and we've also done a huge effort on letting people know where they can get health insurance if they've lost their coverage because of job loss.

And we really did a coordinated effort with the New Mexico Health Exchange, the Human Services Department and Medicaid, the New Mexico Medical Insurance Pool and the Governor's Office, and actually came up with a tool that people could use that tells them that what programs they're eligible for and whether they can get documents or premium subsidies.

Although, this is not in our bailiwick, the Medicaid enrollment, as you would expect, has gone up. It's presenting budget problems for the Legislature and for HSD. One of the provisions for accepting federal relief on Medicaid was that the states could not take anybody off the program and, as you may suspect, you know, there's a certain amount of churn that occurs in Medicaid, people are eligible, then become ineligible, all of the rest of that. Well, right now, nobody is becoming ineligible, so those folks are staying on the plan, plus there are, you know, new folks getting on.
So, normally, over the past few years, the Medicaid increases by about .15 per month -- percent per month, now the increase is about 1.75 percent per month. So, if it continues -- they're projecting a total enrollment in the Medicaid program, of almost 900,000 people by the end of the calendar year, even though we're getting enhanced match, that still has a significant cost impact on this.

Any questions on these orders, or else, Melissa, you can go on to the next.

Okay.

(Note: Screen sharing.)

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: Okay, when I met with you back in November, you said that I thought that the structure of the OSI did not make a lot of sense, and it did not allow folks from the outside who deal with us, to know where to go. So, in this reorganization, we had tried to concentrate our focus in three broad categories: Consumer services, which is new; life and health; and then reporting under "Robert," all the property and casual functions.

I think it will give us something we've badly needed, and that is, really, a sense of
where do you belong in the organizations and where
do folks on the outside, where do they go when
they want to access specific sources?

Now, the other part of this that will
become apparent to the external world, is that
while we've made some changes in our website,
we're going to be dramatically changing and
improving that website, and we're consolidating
some of the functions that we have. You know,
right now, we have individual units that are
insanely busy certain times of the year, and not
so busy other times of the year. This new
structure will allow us to do some cross-training
and be able to re-use resources as we need
them.

Now, we would have liked to have done
this reorganization sooner, but we needed to get
through at least the initial months of COVID but,
most importantly, we needed the right people to
lead up life and health units and consumer
services, and I'm very pleased, excited about the
folks we've been able to recruit, and Julie
started this week and Angelica starts next week.

Do you want to move on a little bit?

(Note: Screening sharing.)
SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: So Julie is someone I've known, she was the Medicaid director here for a number of years, but most importantly to me, is that, believe it or not, she's one of the few people in the organization now who actually have insurance -- actually have experience being on private insurance side. And I think that's really important to give us the level of understanding that we need. So she's worked for several different private insurance companies, most recently, she was the COO for a Medicaid health plan in Hawaii.

Thankfully, Julie kept her home here in Santa Fe and she became a New Mexico resident in 1974, so she's been here a long, long time. She's got claims experience, lots of management experience, knows government inside and out. I'm really very, very, very, very pleased about having her on board.

The same thing is true with our new Consumer Services director. I told (Zoom froze) that we wanted an agency that's far more consumer focused, consumer friendly and I was thinking about consumers and essentially all that we do. We do have a fair amount of consumer services now,
but we don't always do it in the best and most
customer-friendly way, we need to make sure all
our policies, our rules, our actions, keep that
customer focus in mind.

She was most recently the general
counsel for New Mexico Workers' Comp, she worked
for the AG's Office for quite sometime, you see
she has other experience there, has a law degree
from some small college called Harvard, and she
really, I think, is going to be an exceptional
asset to the organization.

So, getting these key people in place is
going to make a world of difference.

On a personal level, you know, quite
honestly, I'm not embarrassed to say it, I need
help. We need good people who can take over some
of these responsibilities and manage things,
because I'm having to do a level of nitty and
gritty that really detracts me from doing some of
the big stuff that needs to be done. So I'm very
pleased about them. Julie started Monday, and the
other -- Angelica, starts next Monday, okay?

MR. HODGES: Mr. Superintendent, this is
Ben Hodges. I'd like to complement you on this
organizational chart. I think the flow will be
much easier and much better for both the insured
and the insurer, and I commend you for this.

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: Well, I thank you
for that. I took to heart your comment in the
nominating committee back in November where you
said that people didn't know where to go or who to
contact and all of the rest of that, and we're
going to address all of those concerns.

I'll tell you that, at least so far, the
response from staff has been positive, I think
there's excitement about the new people, there are
two or three people that are unhappy, as they
always are. I'm hoping they'll go job hunting,
I'm going to be blunt and tell you we've had a few
people who are not used to being held accountable
for what they do and their responsibility, I think
everybody now understands that we have a different
sheriff and we're doing things differently. We've
had what I will call some strategic retirements,
which have actually benefited the agency, and I
think we'll see some more changes along those
lines.

And if you don't want to take my word
for it, you can certainly ask Melissa. There is a
profoundly different way of doing things, and I
think it's the kind of accountability and responsiveness that you have every right to expect out of this office.

So we do have some new hires here, as you see, those are listed on the left by office and position. We do, however, still have some vacancies.

We recently made a request to the Governor's Office and Secretary of Finance and Administration that we be allowed to fill some of these vacancies. As you know, all of state government's are under a hiring freeze, but since we don't use any general funds in support of positions, we're asking for an exception. And I must say that, you know, the Legislative Finance Committee has been very supportive of us, because they know how short staffed we are, and I'm hoping -- hopeful we'll get the green light to fill those nine positions.

We did -- I know that we asked the committee for your assistance on two positions, one was for the healthcare attorney which we have filled, and the other is for the attorney for the Patient Compensation Fund. We have our two final interviews on that, later today, I'm hoping we
will make a selection very soon. This is something we really need to fill. Mike DeMers, who some of you may know, has been the adjustor and handled many things for the PCF over the past few years. Mike unfortunately has had his third heart attack here recently, and he's finally taking his doctor's advice to retire and quit working like he has been.

So we brought a new firm on to assist with the Adjustment Services, but we need an attorney to review and negotiate the actual final settlements and prepare all the legal documents and all the rest of that.

So, we're moving along, but we do really need these other nine positions filled. Any questions about staffing or operations?

MS. CARPENTER: Allegra Capenter.

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: Yes.

MS. CARPENTER: Just a question, you said that the agency has brought in an adjusting company, is that something that has -- I don't know anything about that.

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: We did an RFP, Request for Proposals, and from that, we selected the firm called Integrion. Integrion serves as
the administrator for the Property and Casualty Guaranty Fund, they administer a number of other such funds. We've worked with them over the years. They're actually wholly owned by New Mexico Mutual, the large Workers' Comp fund, and they turned in a very good proposal. Mike DeMers, the gentleman I referenced who we're going to be losing, is doing the training for those folks and essentially they will report to the PCF attorney as soon as we can get that attorney handled right. Most of the work right now is running through Bryan Brock, our general counsel, but it has taken him away from his other responsibilities.

MS. CARPENTER: Thank you.

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: And that contract, Allegra, like all our contracts, is a public document, if that's something you or the other committee members want to see, I'm happy to share it with you.

MS. CARPENTER: Thank you.

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: Was that a yes?

MS. CARPENTER: I'd like to see it.

Thank you, very much.

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: Okay.

Next slide.
SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: Well, I freely admit, this is high level, but in part it's at high level because we haven't finalized our fiscal year '22 agency request. This budget number that you see for '21, is the same number we shared with you back in June. The '22 represents a $575,000 increase, that money is for two things: Being allowed to fill all of our allotted positions, some contract expansions for our Life and Health Unit because, as I mentioned, we had to do two actuarial firms, and we think that will continue, and then I'm sure that some of you have followed the saga of the Public Regulatory Commission which got into an unfortunate public battle with the wrong person, and then they have been told they have to vacate this building no later than September 30th.

Now, this building is pretty much a ghost town right now, anyway, I mean, our five or six people are about the only folks here. But their departure means that the New Early Childhood Department will be moving into the PERA building, and it also means that our offices on the second floor and the third floor where all of producer
licensing is housed, as well as IT, have to relocate to the fourth floor.

So, everything for the OSI will be consolidated on the fourth floor. That's the good news. The bad news, even though the other departments are getting money related to the move, we are not, so we're asking for an authorization to let us use more of our fees to pay for those costs.

As some of you are aware that we also have had to expand our footprint in Albuquerque, we're in the same building, but we ran out of space in that small first-floor office, we'll be moving to the fourth floor, ironically, in the Albuquerque building. We're not planning for offices for everybody, because I think as COVID has taught everybody, not everybody has to be in an office. And, of course, Legislative Finance Committee is very interested in trying to reduce office expense, lease costs and all the rest of that, but we were able to negotiate a lease on that Albuquerque space considerably below market. I think the General Services Department square footage lease cost in Albuquerque is $22 and we negotiated a rate of $16, so they were very
pleased with what we were able to do, and that space is being fitted out now.

Albuquerque, of course, is far and away, the largest home for both insurance companies and brokers as well as for the people we insure. We need a service office, a consumer center there where people can go, so that was another motivation for our space.

Scott and others know that we are still trying to open an office in Las Cruces, but I don't know whether we will get the green light on that or not. I think it's important that we have a presence in Southern New Mexico. We have none, now. It's difficult to do some of the servicing we have to do out of Albuquerque or Santa Fe and looking at our Investigations Unit, alone. If they have to send officers out to Roswell or Hobbs or Las Cruces or Deming or wherever, they spend most of their time traveling, so it would be better if we could have some base of operations in Las Cruces.

So we will be asking for authorization, again, I don't know whether we will be successful this year or not.

But as you see, it's not much of a
request, it obviously calls for no additional
general funds, the Legislative Finance Committee
and the Department of Finance and Administration
have instructed most state agencies to re-- to submit a budget request that reflects a five
operating reduction, there is a deflection for Medicaid and for public education, but otherwise,
they're not looking for any kind of expansion, so hopefully they'll understand we're not asking for expansion, we're just asking for the ability to deal with this housing issue, the office space issue and to deal with -- make sure we have money
to fill all 97 positions that well we are having to.

MR. HODGES: Mr. Superintendent, this is Ben Hodges again. Can I go back to the PERA building for a moment?

Do you have an estimate what your moving costs might be to renegotiate one floor to another in the PERA building.

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: We're still working on that, it has not been made clear to us, yet, Mr. Hodges, as to whether we're going to be able to keep our office furniture in our other offices and bring it up, and whether PFC is taking
their office furniture, of course, they have no location to take it to, they will -- excuse me, have been told to work from home. If I were to give you a ballpark number, it would be somewhere around $20,000, which is not a lot of money.

MR. HODGES: Again, what is the time frame involved?

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: They want us to accomplish our move in October.

MR. HODGES: Very good. Thank you.

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: We get to inherit very nice offices of the five individual PRC commissioners. And, actually, we've already offered one of those offices to the Secretary of Early Childhood, because the space she's going to be in is frankly not nearly as nice. She'll have to make a decision whether she wants to be up here or if she wants to be with all the rest of her staff.

Any other questions?

Final point on this, if I may, we plan to move about -- in terms of office location, we plan to move about 18 staff who currently have office space here will move to the Albuquerque office because they live in Albuquerque, most of
their work is in Albuquerque, the new Director of Consumer Services, for example, will be working out of the Albuquerque office, and many of our legal staff will be housed in Albuquerque, as well.

Any other questions? Okay.

(Note: Screen sharing.)

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: Well, we've been doing our fair share of rule making. You see the ones on top that we've already implemented, we have two pending adoptions, one on PBM's, Pharmacy Benefit Managers and, to be honest, it's just on hold, because there is a major case on PBM in state regulation in front of the U.S. Supreme Court and we, like every other state, are sort of waiting to hear what the Supreme Court has to say about that, and whether the states can regulate PBMs. I'm hoping the answer is yes, but we'll have to wait and see.

Coverages for contraception, as some of the committee members know, we had a draft recommendation, but I heard from a number of people who say these rules need to be reopened. Frankly, I spent the last month figuring out how I could change the rules, but I've been convinced by
the lawyers that the appropriate way to do that is
reopen the hearing and allow this comment to be
put into the record and then have the rules sent
to me for final approval, so we will go through
that process now.

Now, the trade-off is, our original hope
is that we were going to be able to have these
contraceptive coverage rules in place by
September 1, at the latest, now I think,
realistically, we're looking at November 1. But
the input that we have gotten has been very
helpful, and I'm looking forward to a robust
hearing on that.

Now, you'll see the agreement is being
planned, there are actually two hearings going on
today, one, as we speak, on accepted benefits.
Return plans is later today. I think you -- as
some of you know, that to maintain our
accreditation, the National Association of
Insurance Commissioner has -- just issued --
(Note: Audio interruption.)
MS. DENISH: Somebody needs to put their
thing on mute. Okay. Thank you.
SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: We had to adopt
new rules on annual audit and financial reports,
insurance holding companies and corporate
governings. We have hearings scheduled on all of
those later this fall. Will be the so-called
"Mega Title Rule" that we are working diligently
with the title association, in fact, we've
involved them in all of these rules, and in none
of our rule making have we just gone off into the
corner and tried to adopt this without significant
input.

The two other rules that I think are
going to be a challenge, but we will get them
done, one is grievance procedures, where there was
a process underway with a set of rules that I
found overly proscriptive, so they've gone back to
square one, and we're still working on prior
authorization, utilization review following on the
legislation that was adopted by the Legislature a
year or so ago.

Now, as you would expect, I hope, we
also have rule making scheduled for 2021, but we
really, as you can see here, have our hands full
this for this year.

Any questions on this rule making?
Okay, Melissa.

(Note: Screen sharing.)
SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: Okay, 2021. There are three primary pieces of legislation that we're looking at. I want to preface this by saying, I don't know how in the world this is going to work, a 16-day session being conducted virtually with no one being allowed in the Roundhouse. The idea of taking up some of these major pieces of legislation without being able to be there and to manage them, is going to be a huge challenge.

We're trying to find out from legislative leadership and the Governor's Office, what they anticipate the ground rules to be. Those have not been set, but I think as a prime indicator of what we're facing, the office that normally takes -- that does the scheduling for special events, for appearances in the Roundhouse, for Kidney Day, Heart Day, Southern New Mexico Day, Las Cruces Day, on and on and on, they are doing no scheduling, whatsoever. And they're telling other people to anticipate that there will be no such occasions and events during the session.

So, the question arises, how are we going to manage this? Now, we've made a strong commitment that '21 was going to be the year that
we finally pushed forward on revising the Medical Malpractice Act in a serious way, that is still our plan, but we have a lot of logistics to be worked out.

The first piece of legislation is one that I've mentioned that we are going to do what I'm calling a Clean-Up Bill. There shouldn't be things that are controversial about that for you. We need to remove, for example, some of the remaining references to the Insurance Department of the PRC. There are things in there that make reference to federal legislation that's been changed, there are some other provisions that are in conflict that need to be resolved.

Now, the one piece of that, changes that we haven't made a decision on, and I would welcome your input, you probably all are aware of the fact that the fees that we charge are actually set in law, which is a cumbersome way to do business. So anytime we want to raise our lower any kind of fee, and I'll give you an example, I asked earlier this year, "Can we do like many other state agencies do and offer a discounted fee for licensing to New Mexico residents who are Veterans?" And the message that came back from
the attorneys was, "No, you can't do that because you don't have express authority and actual fee amounts are set in statute."

So the question of, do we try to get that changed to give us the discretion to set the fees where we think they need to be to offer some, what I'll call, incentives or rewards, to folks like Veterans? I'm going to be honest with you and tell you that I would love -- you know, we now license 194,000 individual brokers, agents, adjustors and producers. That's a staggering number. The vast majority of those are out of state. You know, I would love to frankly be able to charge the out-of-state people more than we charge the New Mexico people.

Now, as you all know, I'm no lawyer, and I'm not sure we can get away with that, but it doesn't seem right to me, you know, that a broker Texas who wants to sell here or a broker in Oklahoma or wherever, that they should pay the same fee that New Mexico residents pay.

I'll give you another example, third-party administrators, you know that, administrator claims and insurance regulations for large employers, their fee to be licensed as a
third-party administrator in this state is a
hundred dollars, and 50 to renew. That's a
preposterously low rate, particularly given the
work that we have to do to ensure they're meeting
all requirements.

There are other examples of such fees
where we just don't have the discretion to adjust
fees like we need to. So we haven't made the
decision, we are all under marching orders from
both VFA and the Legislative Finance Committee to
find new sources of revenue. Fee adjustments
could be a significant source of revenue, it's not
revenue we need, so it's revenue that could be
swept into the general fund. So we're at least
looking at it, we're looking to see how our fees
stack up to surrounding states and we're looking
at where fees have not been adjusted in quite
sometime.

So, I just wanted to make you aware of
that. We haven't made a final decision.
Obviously, that could be controversial, but we
really would like to get out from underneath the
situation where we have literally no discretion
about what the fee amounts are. The
superintendent, I think, needs to have some
discretion in that regard.

Now, the second --

MR. PERKINS: Mr. Superintendent, this is Randy Perkins. As you are looking and finding out what our surrounding states are doing in regard to that fee structure, I would be very interested in your findings because, you know, I guess I look at this from a selfish point of view, I'm licensed in, you know, 50 jurisdictions, and I don't always see the necessary fees that are coming back and hitting me, so as you undergo this investigation, I'd be very interested in your findings.

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: You know, if we have discretion, I could excuse all the nominating committee members from paying -- I'm joking, of course.

MR. PERKINS: Yes, I know.

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: Mr. Perkins, given the presence of "HUB" across the country, if our office or headquarters has information about what they're paying in different states, that could really be helpful to us.

MR. PERKINS: I will see if I can get that for you.
SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: We don't want to be out of line, obviously, with the surrounding states.

MR. PERKINS: Right.

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: But neither do I want to be essentially giving them a free pass.

MS. CARPENTER: Madam Chair, Superintendent Toal, I just have a question, is the concept that you would exercise that discretion in the same way that you go about rule making, or what would be --

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: Yes, it would have to be done by rule, certainly. I would never give it -- or ask a superintendent to have really discretion, I think we go through the normal rule process.

Any other questions?

MS. DENISH: Any more questions on this agenda item all?

MR. HODGES: I have none.

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: The other two bills, quickly. The ORSA Bill has been put in front of the Legislature multiple times, and it has failed, and its failed because the members of the Trial Bar don't like the NAIC provisions on
confidentiality on domestic companies.

Now, we don't have that many domesticated companies. The big was one that gets everybody's attention is Presbyterian Health Plan. And, I can't speak for the Trial Bar, but I will say their general concern has been they don't want to pass a piece of legislation that allows PHPs to hide information that should be made public. I totally get that, but for accreditation purposes, we have to put this in front of the Legislature and show the National Association of Insurance Commissioners that we at least made the effort to get this Bill passed.

The third piece, as I mentioned, is the Malpractice Act which, for all practical purposes, hasn't been revised in more than 40 years, there is an agreement across all parties, that we need to make changes to the Act, to the caps, to other provisions in there. I think you all know that we've had some new actuarial studies, one which has been completed and another which is underway.

But, more importantly, I have been meeting with all the respective interested parties, the Medical Society, the Trial Lawyers, the Hospital Association, the Defense Lawyers
Association, Malpractice Carriers, I think that's everybody, I've met with all of them, multiple times, to try to get a sense of where people are, what they think needs to be done, and then the plan is over the next two or three months, to essentially conduct a show of diplomacy, by affording trial "balloons" to individual groups saying, "Would this be acceptable? What's wrong with this? What's your reaction to this?" in the hopes that by October we can have some form of a Bill that most of the folks could support and then, of course, we would present that to the Governor's Office. The Governor, to her credit, has not indicated to us what her interests are, she did ask all the respective parties not to introduce a Bill to reform the NMA in the short session and to give us time look at this and study it, and I'm hopeful that we can come forward with something that can at least be the focus of debate and discussion.

We have also not begun talking to the key legislators, which I will start doing right away, to get a sense of where they are and how they think we might be able to manage such a Bill in a virtual session. And, again, I will share
that with all of the interested parties.

But, right now, those are the only pieces of legislation, I think these will be a heavy lift. Of course in the 60-day session, there will be lots of information, a lot of legislation introduced that impacts us, and we'll have to respond to that. And, as usual, much of our time will be consumed with budget.

MS. DENISH: Any other questions from the committee about the legislation?

MR. HODGES: No.

MS. DENISH: Thank you, Superintendent Toal, I appreciate that. That's a very thorough review of the department, I really, really appreciate it.

The next item in our agenda is the public comment, but before we go to actual public comment, I just want to see if anybody on our committee has any comments, just general comments they'd like to make prior to us going -- we have a few people from the public, I think on, so if you would like to either put your comment into the chat room or your questions, especially if you have a question through that, but I think, Jennifer, I saw you raise your hand.
MS. FORD: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just wanted to really appreciate, Superintendent, your incredible diligence on protecting and advocating for consumers, especially just the COVID report. You know, in some ways, consumers are experiencing just extreme financial hardships, health challenges, and I just want to really thank you and your staff for just the monumental time and effort that was put into all of that, all the COVID bulletins, all of the, you know, just shepherd all that through, you know, it just really shows and demonstrates your commitment to create a more consumer-focused bureau, and I'm just really so thankful for the way that you've centered consumers.

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: Thank you, very much for that. I mean, we've tried to be responsive. I want to be quick to note that if it weren't for people like Melissa who, you know, almost starts trembling when I come near her office because she knows some new order or rule or bulletin or something is getting ready to be issued that she's going to have to deal with. They have really busted their tails.

And, as you all know, when -- and I'm
not trying cast aspersions, but when you've had
the same person as superintendent for nine years,
everybody's used to doing things in that
particular way. Completely understandable, I'm
not being critical of that, that's just a fact of
life. So we've had to make a pretty determined
effort to make people understand it's a different
ballgame, it's a different focus, and there are
certainly different expectations about being
consumer responsive. So I appreciate your
comments very much and if it's okay, I will pass
those on to others.

MS. Denish: Mr. Hodges?

MR. HODGES: Madam Chairman, and this
really is, I suspect, addressed to you. Back in
the January 17th meeting, we had a conversation
about the role of the Insurance Nominating
Committee, and at that time, you had suggested
that you would perhaps create a subcommittee to
work with staff to refine the nominating
committee's role to make it more relevant and
beneficial, what is the status of that?

MS. DENISH: From my point of view, I
think we just got caught up in the pandemic, and
we really didn't want to take any staff time or
pull away from that during this period of time, so
the status is inertia --

MR. HODGES: On hold?

MS. DENISH: -- but I don't I think --
was thinking that about that when I read through
the minutes that we might want to get back to that
and see what that's like in the kind of new normal
situation that we now kind of are living in.
And I'm happy to work with the
vice-chair to maybe figure that out with Randy and
the superintendent to think about the
subcommittee, but today there's no progress on
that.

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: Madam Chair, I
think it is something that could be easily
incorporated into a clean-up bill. And when the
House Bill 234 went through the Legislature this
session, as you may know, I made the point that
I'm used to having a Board to report to and that
our -- that it was our intention to get a Board
that has more responsibility than just appointing
a superintendent. Not that that isn't important,
but I do think all state agencies should have some
sort of entity that provides oversight. So, if
you want to get a group together, I think we could
come up with something pretty quickly to put in
the Clean-Up Bill and would be supportive and I
believe the Governor's Office would be very
supportive, as well.

MS. DENISH: What I would like to do is
let me chat with the vice-chair, with Randy, and
is there anybody on here that particularly wants
to serve on a sub-committee, Benny, Allegra? So
we'll put together a little committee and then
I'll talk with you, Mr. Superintendent, about it,
and if Melissa will help us orchestrate maybe a
Zoom meeting to just organize around that and talk
through some of the particulars, we could do that,
okay?

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: That will work.

MS. DENISH: I'll try to do something on
that between now and the middle of September, if
that's acceptable.

MR. HODGES: Thank you Madam Chair.

MS. DENISH: So, Mr. Superintendent, I
wanted to ask you a question back on some of the
COVID things you did, the COVID scams, I meant to
ask this at this time, are there instances where
you've had to work with the Attorney General's
Office? Have there been any substantial COVID
scams that have risen to that level?

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: There have only
been a couple of situations or cases where it was
clearly some kind of scam, and we did refer those
to the Attorney General's Office, but once it gets
in his office, they take control. It's probably
time for us to be issuing another kind of warning
to folks.

The other publicity we need to restart
is being, as you know, we do have a COVID hotline
that we staff from 8 a.m. through 6 p.m., Monday
through Saturday. We got a lot of calls for the
first month or two, they've really died down, but
it's hard for me to believe that all the problems
have gone away. I think people just don't know
that the ability to make that call is out there,
so we're going to do some more publicity about
that.

MS. DENISH: Okay. Thank you.

Are there other -- any other comments
from the Board or from people who might be on this
call that are representing other entities or
public -- some people who I can't see.

MS. CARPENTER: If I could just slip in,
this is Allegra, Madam Chairman.
MS. DENISH: Sure.

MS. CARPENTER: I had said I would want you to send me those documents on Integrion, but just was on the website to see if I could find them, and I couldn't, so if you could forward me any of those documents surrounding that.


MR. HODGES: Madam Chariman?

MS. Denish: Yes.

MR. HODGES: I had one other -- and this is really for Melissa, if she wouldn't mind sharing the slide show presentation with each us individually?

MS. GUTIERREZ: Yes, I'll send it out later on.

MR. HODGES: Perfect. Thank you.

MS. DENISH: Okay.

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: When you're sending things out, remember what I told you that Oklahoma University grads, they go on the bottom of the priority list.

(Note: Laughing.)

MS. DENISH: Okay.

On that note, are there any relevant comments? Anybody in the -- I think we have 15
participants, it looks like, including everybody
whose pictures you can see.

Next meeting I don't know that I'm ready
to calendar that or, Mr. Superintendent, does
anybody have a suggestion? I'm assuming we maybe
want to have an update pre-legislative virtual
session, just to get an idea of where we actually
are, going in, and you may know by then some of
the pre-filings of legislation that might affect
us in some way or another, so I'm thinking maybe
mid-December, does that --

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: Well, that's, as
you know, Madam Chair, that's usually a time when
they're doing Legislative Finance Committee
hearings and all that sort of thing, I haven't
looked at my calendar.

MS. DENISH: Well, actually, I think I
probably should change that, maybe after the first
of the year, right before the session, if you
wanted to -- but we'll send out some suggestions,
how about that? We'll work together and see --

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: That's fine.

MS. DENISH: -- if that seems okay.

Any other comments, questions before we
adjourn and say goodbye?
Okay. If there are none, and nobody --
I just want to say thanks to everybody for getting on. Thanks to the staff and thanks for the people from the public who listened in today, the Governor's Office, and I hope everybody takes good care and stays well while we continue to navigate the landscape.

SUPERINTENDENT TOAL: Thank you all.
MR. PERKINS: Good seeing everyone.
MS. DENISH: Yes, it was good seeing everybody.

Is there a motion to adjourn?
MR. ROMERO: So moved.
MS. DENISH: All in favor just wave goodbye.

(Note: Everyone waving.)
(NOTE: In recess at 10:30 a.m.)
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